

# RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY

Vol. X

Autumn Number, 1941

No. 4

## EDITORIAL BOARD

JOHN BAILLIE	WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN	LYNN HAROLD HOUGH
ROBBINS WOLCOTT BARSTOW	SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT	JAMES R. JOY
ALBERT W. BEAVEN	NOLAN B. HARMON, JR.	G. ASHTON OLDHAM
HOWARD C. ROBBINS		HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

## ADVISORY COUNCIL

John Keith Benton	Angus Dun	Harris Franklin Rall
Harvie Branscomb	Umpfrey Lee	Luther D. Reed
Edgar Sheffield Brightman	Edwin Lewis	Richard Roberts
Clarence Tucker Craig	Halford E. Luccock	Leslie D. Weatherhead
Albert Edward Day	Arthur Cushman	Luther A. Weigle
	McGiffert, Jr.	

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
Drop These Party Cries!.....	Herbert Booth Smith 483
The Form of Revelation.....	Albert Edward Day 495
Australia's Place in the World's Conflict.....	George Stewart 506
Religion and Health.....	Russell L. Dicks 513
The Search for Peace.....	Herbert Welch 525
The Meetinghouse.....	D. Elton Trueblood 534
Canadian Christians and Postwar Reconstruction.....	Claris Edwin Silcox 543
The Prayer Book of Jews and Christians.....	Thomas W. Currie 558
French Civilization and French Collapse.....	Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster 570
Religion in Stone.....	Ralph Adams Cram 580
Do or Die: The "Christian" Colleges.....	Edward E. Aubrey 586
Cast Down But Not Destroyed.....	John Sutherland Bonnell 595
The Christian Doctrine of Vocation.....	George M. Gibson 606
The Quarter's Fiction.....	John C. Schroeder 614
Book Reviews.....	620
Bookish Brevities.....	638
Index—Volume X.....	639

RELIGION IN LIFE is published quarterly by Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. Office of publication, 815 Demonbreun Street, Nashville, Tenn. Entered as second-class matter, January 16, 1932, at the Post Office at Nashville, Tenn., under act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided in Section 1103, act of October 3, 1917, authorized March 16, 1923.

Editorial correspondence should be addressed to RELIGION IN LIFE, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Business correspondence regarding subscriptions, etc., should be addressed to Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year, postage free to U. S. possessions and Mexico; to Canada, 18 cents additional; other foreign postage, 30 cents additional; single copies, 75 cents. For the convenience of readers in Great Britain, subscriptions will be received by The Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C. 1, at the rate of nine shillings and six pence per year.

Published by  
ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS

NEW YORK

NASHVILLE

BOSTON UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS  
LIBRARY

## Who's Who?

**EDWARD E. AUBREY, Ph.D., D.D.** Professor of Christian Theology and Ethics, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

**JOHN SUTHERLAND BONNELL, D.D.** Minister of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York, New York.

**RALPH ADAMS CRAM, Litt.D., LL.D.** Architect and Author, Boston, Massachusetts.

**THOMAS W. CURRIE, D.D.** President, Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Austin, Texas.

**ALBERT EDWARD DAY, D.D.** Minister, First Methodist Church, Pasadena, California.

**RUSSELL L. DICKS, B.D.** Associate Pastor, Highland Park Methodist Church, Dallas, Texas.

**FRIEDRICH WILHELM FOERSTER, Ph.D.** Former Professor of Philosophy and Pedagogy at the University of Munich.

**GEORGE M. GIBSON, D.D.** Minister of the United Church of Hyde Park, Chicago, Illinois.

**JOHN C. SCHROEDER, D.D., Litt.D.** Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut.

**CLARIS EDWIN SILCOX, D.D.** Secretary of the Canadian National Council of the World Alliance for International Friendship, Toronto, Canada.

**HERBERT BOOTH SMITH, D.D., L.H.D.** Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

**GEORGE STEWART, Litt.D., Ph.D.** Minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Stamford, Connecticut.

**D. ELTON TRUEBLOOD, Ph.D.** Professor of The Philosophy of Religion and Chaplain, Stanford University, California.

**HERBERT WELCH, D.D., Litt.D., LL.D.** Bishop of The Methodist Church, Chairman of the Methodist Commission for Overseas Relief.

Copyright, 1941, by Whitmore and Stone. All rights reserved—no part of this magazine may be produced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper.

Printed in the United States of America



## Drop These Party Cries!

HERBERT BOOTH SMITH

**D**ENOMINATIONS are no new thing. Judaism had them, Christianity had them. Islam has them and the student of church history will tell you that every Church under the sun has them. The Jews are usually regarded as a unified people and yet in Jesus' time they were split into Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes. When Christianity came upon the scene it might have been hoped that the teaching of Jesus would result in a great brotherhood of His followers, but it was not long until divisions crept in. Hence this word of Paul, "Brothers, for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ I beg of you all to drop these party cries."

The first chapter of I Corinthians is very comforting reading, for it shows that human nature hasn't changed much through the years. Saint Paul in writing to the church there found that four parties had sprung up during his absence, each called after the name of the leader. (A sect is defined as a body of people united by some doctrines which they hold exclusively and which separate them from other bodies and from the universal Church. It usually originates in some individual who teaches a peculiar doctrine and who is considered as its founder.)

For one thing there was the Pauline Party. It was probably composed of the earliest converts who had felt the power of the Apostle's influence, and had remained faithful to the teaching of their founder. Then there was the party of Apollos: Apollos was a learned Jew of Alexandria, who had gone to Corinth and had appealed to many there who preferred a more philosophical style of presentation of the Gospel to the simple type of Saint Paul. He could harmonize the Old Testament teaching with that of current philosophy, and he had an allegorical method of interpreting it to prove that Jesus was the Messiah. Then there was a third group called the Cephas or Peter Party. They probably were Jewish Christians who felt that circumcision and other Jewish rites should be carried over into Christianity, and hence admired the more conservative Peter, rather than the more liberal and progressive Paul. Curiously enough there was a fourth set called the Christ Party. It may have arisen as a protest against those three who had adopted other party names. Its

members seem to have become more extreme and fanatical as the strife went on, and to have fallen far short of the name of their blessed Leader. Facing such a situation, Paul asks them to drop these divisive party cries; for he hates cliques and divisions. He certainly doesn't want any denomination named after him, for he feels that all should be subservient to Jesus, the great Head of the Church. One wishes some people today would read to their profit the words of the Apostle. They might learn the tragedy of division and the beauty of harmony.

I love that story of Lloyd George. He was driving through North Wales with a well-known Free Churchman and the talk turned upon denominational differences. The famous statesman remarked: "The Church to which I belong is torn with a fierce dispute. One section says that baptism is *in* the name of the Father, and the other that it is *into* the name of the Father. I belong to one of those parties. I feel most strongly about it. I would die for it, in fact;—but I forget which it is." That bit of humor says a good deal in a few words.

We wish to advance to our position now, however, by considering by way of preliminary the opposite viewpoint from our thesis. Nothing is to be gained by ridicule or ignorance. There is much to be said in favor of denominationalism. A very wise book was written some years ago entitled *Unitive Protestantism*, by John T. McNeill, of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. While he is enthusiastic about the progress that is being made toward the unity of our churches and feels that nothing can stop it, at the same time he feels that serious misdirection of the movement may easily be possible. He points out two present-day tendencies which might make united churches less efficient spiritually than are the numerous denominations of today. One of them is the danger of advocating union solely on the ground urged by big business. Size is not a spiritual argument; neither is massed power or business economy. The second danger pointed out is that of a failure to make proper adjustments with the past. Churches that rose in past years in most cases probably had good reason for doing so. Hence those who feel they must kill the old Church in order to build the new are probably wrong. "A past that is neglected always rises to take vengeance for the neglect."

With these conditions in mind, let us face the question why so many Protestant denominations have arisen. Most of them probably rose as witnesses to certain neglected truths which they felt needed emphasis at

the time. Take the Presbyterian communion for example. In an age when the Church of Rome claimed that salvation lay only in its pale, and that the Pope held the keys of heaven and hell, our forefathers arose to assert that God alone is the author of salvation and that every believer is a priest and that the Church should be governed by representatives elected by the people. There was a reason for the distinctive existence then, but most of those viewpoints have since been accepted by other evangelical groups. Think also of our Baptist friends. They arose as a protest against the union of Church and State, which obliterated the line between the Church and the world. This meant that many unregenerate persons were classed as Christians. They demanded that the Church be separate from the world and freed from state interference. That battle has been won, however, and there is apparently no reason for them to stand alone any longer. What about the Congregational group? Their system of government is a protest against ecclesiastical hierarchy. Every local congregation manages its own affairs. While we may not all accept their idea of polity, we do admire their intellectual freedom and their insistence that man should determine for himself how he should worship God. Then, too, the Methodist folk have a noble heritage. In an age of spiritual deadness and fox-hunting parsons, when religion was a matter of ceremonies and outward conformity, Methodists arose to tell the world that a real spiritual experience of grace was necessary, and not merely the formality of church membership. So we might go on; and we would find that all of the great major denominations arose out of given historical situations which justified their witness at that particular time. But the question facing us now is this: if in the progress of the Christian centuries the contribution of a given denomination has become the property of all the other members of the great Protestant family, does the historical origin of a given Church justify its continuous and separate existence? If its distinctive principles are now common property, should the divisive name be retained?

This was the contention of Rev. Harold Brierley of London, in his advocacy of closer fellowship of the churches. He felt that denominationalism was doomed because our divisions have ceased to have distinctive value. The specific aspects of truth testified to by the different churches have today become part of the common stock of our Protestant faith, and not a single really vital element of that faith would be lost through church

union. Why then should we impair our efficiency and jeopardize the progress of the Kingdom of God by clinging to a separateness and an isolation which is not justified?

A second possible blessing of denominations is that they allow for differences of temperament as well as of theology. We are not all built the same way. Some enjoy the stately worship of the Episcopal Church and some the more informal worship of the Congregational Church. Some appreciate the dignified and thoughtful preaching of the Presbyterian Church, and others prefer the more dramatic and fervent message of the Methodist Church. If we were all huddled together in one group, one questions whether everybody would be happy, because there would be so many unsatisfied preferences. The real causes for the existence of some of our churches are not merely historical or accidental or theological—they are also psychological. They minister to different needs of our complex human nature. The religious wants of some folk are largely intellectual; of others, practical; of others, esthetic, and of others, emotional. Any Church to be large enough to hold all types of Christians must be big enough to minister to these varied needs.

Another blessing of the existence of denominations is that they make possible the emphasis of certain doctrines which otherwise might be neglected in the general scheme of thought. For example, the Baptist Church theoretically is bound by no creed save the New Testament; but for two generations much of its energy has been devoted to discussions of the meaning of a Greek verb and the proper fencing of the Lord's table. In many of their churches the great stained window behind the pulpit is devoted to a picture of the ritual by which alone one can enter the Baptist Church. This may seem to some to be an unexaggerated emphasis, and yet perhaps it is true that the importance of baptism should be stressed by one Christian group lest it be overlooked. Creeds are attempts to interpret the meaning of the Christian faith and the sacraments, which have only a symbolic meaning to some, are the most real thing in the world to others. The theological interest plays a large part in religion, and customs and ceremonies root deep down in human nature. Different Churches allow room for different minds.

But when all is said and done, the fact must be admitted that we are facing a different world today from that of our forefathers. Points of emphasis have changed. Fashions change in thought as well as in dress.

May I quote from the Centennial Sermon of Francis L. Patton at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1912: "I am very free to admit that the issues of today are very different from those of a former generation. The things in which we agree with our brethren of other Christian communions are more important than those in which we differ. The points which distinguish our theology are not necessarily those of greatest controversial importance at the present day. There has been a subsidence of interest in regard to some questions, due largely to the emergence of acute controversial interest in other and more fundamental issues. The day of hot controversy between Calvinists and Arminians has passed. The thought of the theological world has been occupied in recent years with questions which bear more radically upon the truth and value of historic Christianity."

This master theologian has well expressed the situation. We are facing today a pagan world in which the debate is not between different ideas of God, but whether there is any God; not between different Christologies, but whether Jesus ever lived. Nobody seems to want to take anything for granted; and so Churches that were wont to fight one another are now brigading themselves together for warfare on the common enemy. The lines of cleavage do not run vertically between the Churches as they used to, but horizontally through the denominations. There are Modernists and Fundamentalists in all churches; and a Fundamentalist Baptist and a Fundamentalist Presbyterian are much closer to each other than a Modernist Presbyterian and a Fundamentalist Presbyterian are to each other. So that many of the old denominational fences are simply broken down—they exist only in name; they are like the boundaries between counties which exist in big black lines on the map but do not really exist out in the fields. You cross them without a jolt. In view of all this, we turn now to consider a few reasons for closer fellowship between evangelical Protestant Christians in America today:

*1. There is the Argument of Experience:*

Experience is very different from theory. The one works a-priori and the other a-posteriori; that is to say, one precedes the event and one follows it. One is a guess and the other a memory. One says, "theoretically this scheme ought to work," while the other says, "practically this scheme has worked." History is a very interesting study, for there is no guessing about it—it is a statement of things which have actually taken

place. Our question now is: have the results of church union in practical experience been so successful that they can be cited as an argument in its favor?

I believe the answer to this question is in the affirmative. The subject is a much larger one than is commonly believed. A recent writer shows that the effort toward unification has been a consistent principle of Protestantism ever since the Reformation. Luther, Calvin, Cranmer and others worked toward this end. Many folk today seem to imagine that efforts toward union are all confined to recent years, and are all instigated by Modernist thinkers. The fact is that many such efforts have been put forth by the most stalwart defenders of the faith. The church union movement is at least a hundred and twenty-five years old. In 1817 there was an effort to promote church union in Prussia. About the same time, certain small Presbyterian groups came together in Scotland, Ireland and Canada, thus beginning the long series of steps by which Scotch Presbyterianism has now become practically one. But it is true that especially in the last quarter century we have come to feel the absurdity of some of our ecclesiastical fences, and have made gates in some of them, and taken others down entirely. One thinks of the Cumberland and Presbyterian reunion, and of the happy union of the Congregational and Christian Churches. The important and impressive union of the Methodist Churches of the United States is such a recent accomplishment in ecclesiastical history that it needs no more than a mention here. Then there is the great experiment in fraternity put on by our Canadian friends in the marriage of the Congregational, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches into the United Church of Canada. Since this is the most conspicuous example of all interdenominational unions, let us glance at some of its results and see whether the experiment has proven to be justified.

Dr. R. J. Wilson, Secretary of the Bureau of Literature and Information of the United Church of Canada, was authority for the following statements of fact as they were a few years ago:

Since the consummation of the Union in 1925, most satisfactory progress has been made. Three hundred new Sunday Schools were organized in one year. Four hundred ten congregations in small towns have been reduced to one-half that number of strong self-supporting churches. The financial overhead has been reduced, salaries advanced, stronger preachers secured, better music provided and the Home Mission Board has been



relieved of the useless expenditure of its funds. Charges and congregations have been regrouped. One Presbytery in Manitoba reports for the first time in its history that every district will be supplied with a Sunday School and preaching service. In a recent year two hundred seventy-eight stations where an annual grant had formerly been required have been raised to the status of self-support and are no longer a charge on Home Mission funds. One hundred fifty new fields, with six hundred preaching places have been opened in new territory in which no Protestant services have been previously held. Curiously enough, in spite of these amalgamations of churches, there was no surplus of ministers in the United Church of Canada and less than a dozen men were reported as without charges, and they could easily be placed. The opening up of new fields in needy areas has more than compensated for the closing of churches in congested places. Naturally, where there is unity of command and oversight, planning and strategy are possible which cannot be given under the old system. Christian soldiers are as much encouraged by re-enforcements as were the men in the first World War. But, as Dr. Wilson agrees, the main assets of the United Church are not in money and store, but in her marvelous spirit of co-operation and loyalty, as workers together with God.

*2. There is also the Argument of Efficiency:*

After all, the work of Jesus Christ has a right to be well done. We have no right to misrepresent the cause of Christ by doing His service in a way which no business firm would countenance for a moment. That was a fitting slogan adopted some years since by the Church Extension Board in Brooklyn: "Every church an active force in the community, with a service as wide as human life, as deep as human need and as potent as the love of Christ." That certainly is a worthy ideal.

The main reason for a change in the method of doing a given piece of work anywhere is the desire for improvement and increased efficiency. If we are satisfied with things as they are, why agitate for any change? If on the other hand we are wasting God's gifts and poorly advertising His cause to the community, perhaps reform should be the order of the day.

Facts must answer this question. Let us face some of them: It was reported some time back that there were one hundred ninety-one different Protestant sects or denominations in the United States. No one State has all of them, thank God. Illinois leads the list with 144. New York



has only 122. Nevada gets the lowest prize with 15. Forty-five of these churches have less than one thousand members in the entire country. The first prize for smallness goes to the Primitive Friends, with a grand total of 25 members. The Bullockite Freewill Baptists number 36. The Plymouth Brethren-Sixth, are reduced to 88; the General Six-Principle Baptists to 293, and the Old Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit-Predestinarian Baptists to 304. Consider for a moment the subdivisions of our larger groups: There are 9 denominations of Presbyterian faith and order, 14 kinds of Baptists, and 18 kinds of Lutherans. Even the peaceable Quakers have 4 bodies and the Churches of the Living God have 3. This seems strange indeed. Besides these leading denominations, there are some which are never heard of except in a religious census. Did you ever hear the following: "Church of God in Jesus Christ," "Church of God and Saints of Christ," "United Zion's Children," "Defenseless Church," "Pillar of Fire," "Christadelphians," "Christian Workers for Friendship," "Zion Union Apostolic," "Hephziba Faith Association," "Friends of the Temple," "Social Brethren," "Church Transcendent"? Surely Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed in names like some of these. Isn't it pathetic that the Church of Christ should be so cut up and divided?

But consider the thing from a different angle. Take a little journey into a few towns where there are more competing churches than seem wise. One Missouri village of three hundred has six churches; an Illinois town of fifteen hundred has nine denominations (an average of 167 apiece if all went to church); a Vermont town of thirty-five hundred has thirteen; a Pennsylvania town has three Presbyterian churches, three United Presbyterian Churches, three Methodist, two Episcopal and one Disciples. A certain Western town of eight hundred people has eight church buildings, every one of them ugly, and all Christians working in jealousy of each other. The *Independent Magazine* tells of another place of 1,347 inhabitants, with eight denominations, seven church buildings and a church-going population of one hundred forty-two persons. In a little town of seven hundred near the Atlantic Coast there are five church buildings, of which three are closed, while the remaining two groups are barely existing. These are rather common and more or less usual instances.

But if this situation is deplorable in the home field, what must it be in the foreign? How tragic that we should transplant our denominational differences to lands beyond the tide, where a united Christian Church should present a solid front against the incursions of paganism! Many of

our divisive names are incapable of translation into the language of the non-Christian world without getting something ludicrous. For example, in Chinese the Presbyterian Church becomes "The Church of the Ruling Old Men"—that is not so bad. But the Baptist Church is translated "The Big Wash Church," while the Protestant Episcopal Church becomes "The Church of the Kicking Overseers." Imagine a Southern Baptist Hindu or a Dutch Reformed Japanese! The problem of the foreign field is not whether people shall be Southern Baptists or Northern Baptists; not whether they should be U. S. Presbyterians or U. S. A. Presbyterians; not whether they should be Missouri Synod Lutherans or United Lutherans; it is whether they should be pagans or Christians. It is a matter of God or no God there—it is not a question of the mode of baptism or the nature of election or the manner of the second coming of Christ. Thank God, therefore, that our Christian converts on the foreign field are teaching us the lesson of working together with other Christians for the glory of our common Lord. Bishop Westcott was right when he said that if Church Union ever comes it will begin out in the circumference and move in toward the center. Perhaps this will be one of the reflex blessings of our overseas service for Christ: that we shall learn how to magnify the essential and minimize the non-essential, in order that He may be all and in all.

*3. There Is the Argument of Influence: the Impress of a United Church in Secular Affairs:*

Some years ago when a prominent British minister was leaving America after an extended visit, he was asked by the ubiquitous reporter as to some of his reactions. He said that one surprise to him was the increased prestige of the Roman Catholic Church judged by the amount of space it received in the daily press. Other observers have been similarly impressed. One explanation is that Roman Catholicism is united, while Protestantism is divided. It stands to reason that America will take more seriously a voice which speaks for several million Romanists than it will a voice which speaks for a few hundred thousand Protestants.

Can you think back a few years to the time of the Great War of 1914-1918? If so, you remember that the only Protestant agency which the government could officially recognize was an interdenominational movement like the Y.M.C.A. It could not show partiality to any one of the several Protestant communions at the expense of the others. This bears

out what Lloyd George once said to Dr. Jowett, "If the churches of England united on anything, no government could withstand their will." Of course, no government would be afraid to offend the Presbyterian group or the Methodist company or the Baptist crowd—but it is a very different thing to antagonize the Church of Jesus Christ, for that bulks large in the public eye, while the others do not. It is too bad we are so successful in singing solos, but make such a poor chorus!

Think for a moment of some of our problems here in America. We have a population somewhere in the neighborhood of one hundred twenty-five million people. About half of these are either foreign born or of foreign-born parents. Perhaps two-thirds of the population are outside the membership of any church. What is the Church to do as she faces a situation like that? The best she can do will be but little unless she puts all her men side by side under one Commander, instead of separating them into two hundred companies. No one denomination can hope to achieve any national reform alone. The problem of marriage and divorce, for example, can be solved only by all the churches agreeing to take a united stand in the matter of the remarriage of divorcees, but if the Baptist minister has one rule and the Presbyterian another and the Episcopal rector another, how will we get anywhere? Take such a matter as temperance, or peace, or the Christianizing of business conditions, or the electing of good men to public office. In any great crisis we drop our party cries and shout a common yell; but when the emergency is gone we seem to drop back into our little anthems again. Isn't it too bad!

But God be praised, we are learning. If we are all going to be together in heaven, maybe it is well to get acquainted on earth. Since 1908 we have had the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, which speaks for a church constituency of some twenty-five million church members. Nor is this move toward an ecumenical Church confined to America. As a gradual outgrowth of the Life and Work Conference in Stockholm in 1925 and the Faith and Order Conference in Lausanne in 1927, a World Council of Churches is now in active process of formation. At the great international Conferences of the last decade, all of the great family groups (save one) of the churches which worship Jesus Christ as God and Saviour, were represented by delegates from every quarter of the earth. Here was concrete evidence that our differences are of less importance than the things in which we are in accord. For here men of

almost every race and tongue could sit in harmonious conference upon those things that touch our Church and State. But someone might say: why should the church concern itself with matters ordinarily left to politicians? That's just the trouble. We have left them to politicians too long, and they have made such a mess of things that the men of Christ are trying to bridge the bloody chasm in His name. There must be built up an international fellowship of those who have the mind of Christ—a pan-Christian party, which will insist on trying questions at the bar not only of the Ten Commandments, but also of the Sermon on the Mount. The problems of the world have at last appeared in this present conflict in all their immensity, and have produced the conviction that no single denomination can solve them alone. Some of us believed in the League of Nations, but we believe much more strongly in the League of Christians. We hold that the Golden Rule will help more than scraps of paper and that friendships are more potent than battleships. Sooner or later we shall have, God willing, a united Church presenting a single Saviour to a divided world. Then the voice of the Church shall be so amplified that it will indeed be heard round the world, and politicians and statesmen and kings and princes will realize that they must take a lesson from Jesus Christ in the handling of the affairs of mankind.

*4. Finally: There Is the Argument of Example. A United Church Would Help to Answer the Prayer of Christ, for a Testimony Before the World:*

To the Christian, the final argument for anything is the will of Christ. And so as we close our consideration of this theme we ask whether a coming together of His followers would be in accordance with the desire of our Saviour. Of course, the great verse which comes at once to mind is that expression in the high priestly prayer of our Lord: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be one, . . . that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." Jesus seems clearly here to say that the unity of His followers will be an overwhelming argument to the world for His deity. If that is so, our divisions and denominations are an advertisement on the other side. Of course Christians are really one now, because they are spiritually united to the Father and the Son, whose lives they share. In this deep sense the unity of the Church cannot be broken by outward

divisions. But this inward unity ought also to show itself in visible harmony in order that the world may see and believe.

Take just one leaf out of the history of the apostolic church—and you will there see how it is possible to solve some of these divisive questions. We read in Acts 15 of a council which met at Jerusalem to consider a problem more serious than any which divides Protestant churches today. The question was whether Christ's salvation for men had to be supplemented by ceremonial rites to make it effective. It proved to be a question on which agreement could not be found. The modern Church would have split—but what did the early Church do? No attempt was made to bind all Christians to a uniform practice. Each party gave the other the right hand of fellowship in a brotherly agreement to disagree. Then the apostles went their ways, with the understanding that each should preach the Gospel as he saw it. They trusted one another to be honest, in love to their common Lord. And they reported to the Church that it was the Holy Spirit who showed them how to settle their difficulty. He did not make them think alike—but He did something vastly better. He gave them "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." Let us never admit that minor theological differences preclude Christian fellowship in the Lord; for that idea is the mother of sectarianism and division. The Scripture does not insist on a uniform Church; but it does say that we should love the brethren and be at peace among ourselves.

What is the conclusion of the whole matter? Simply this: Thank God, in spite of all discouragements and problems, the fact of Church union is moving on its way, and with God's blessing nothing can stop it.

# The Form of Revelation

ALBERT EDWARD DAY

**W**HAT we call revelation is the awakening to the ultimate meanings of experience.

The word "*ultimate*" does not satisfy the writer, but he can find no better. It is an effort to differentiate the temporal meaning from the eternal, the merely human from the divine, the trivial from the cosmic. The *experience* may be new or old—as new as the latest social crisis, as old as the first awe at the pageant of the night sky. The *meaning* may be only partially apprehended and very faultily interpreted. The *awakening*, always celestial in its ultimate origins, may be terrestrial in its immediate origin. But where there is an awakening to the ultimate meaning of an experience there is revelation.

The traditional notion of revelation as the transmission of ideas from the divine mind to the human, one is compelled to dismiss as not being compatible with our conception of God's relationship with man. That relationship is not a coercion but a wooing. It does not reduce man to an automaton, but invites him to be a partner in discovery and deed. Nor is the conception of transmissive knowledge apropos to the actual character of the Bible itself, with its transient, fallible human elements so evident to every intelligent reader. Transmission and determinism are coherent ideas. If man's mind is a mere puppet of the divine mind, God can make man think as God wants him to think. But if the mind is free, in any real sense, all that a divine idea can do is to "stand at the door and knock." Transmission and inerrancy are also consistent concepts but not transmission and conjecture. I cannot follow those who declare that faith "by means of revealed words" "adheres vitally to the substance of things we hope for," or speak "of these dogmatic formulae of divine origin," or say "the free generosity of God chooses concepts which reveal God to us." What we are actually confronted with, as Temple has so well said, is not "revealed truths, but truths of revelation."<sup>1</sup>

Is revelation merely a religious name for discovery? Does anything happen to history that is not already *in* history? The issue there is sharply

<sup>1</sup> *Nature, Man and God.*



drawn between theistic naturalism and supernaturalism. Perhaps the writer has not yet rightly appraised the arguments of the naturalists, but he notices that the men who are most insistent upon immersing God in the historical process and who almost go into philosophical hysterics whenever it is suggested that God is *above* history and *breaks into* history, nevertheless are compelled to smuggle into the process something that was not there before. Their agitated minds seem to come to rest when the new element is characterized as an *emergent* rather than as a visitant from another realm. They are happy when they can describe the *event*, whose meaning becomes revelation, as something which the community *approaches* rather than *receives*. But they cannot by definition or by rephrasing evacuate the concept of the *new*, nor escape the recognition that something appeared in history which was not there before. They must employ the very vocabulary of disclosure. All of which seems to be either an identification of God with history so that the new is new in the life of God as well as new to history; or else it is an affirmation that nothing is really new either to God or to history; or it is a backstairs effort to introduce the new guest into the family so stealthily that no one will be aware that there is a stranger in the house.

I cannot identify God with history. There is much of it that is not God, but the defiance of God. God may use Hitler as He used the Assyrian. But there are other instruments He would prefer to use. And Hitler, himself, in himself, is the defeat of God; not to be sure the final defeat but nevertheless a real defeat, just as surely as in the biblical theory, Satan, though not the final negation of God, is in himself not God. There is much in history that is not God. There is much in God that is not yet in history nor ever will be. It belongs to eternity.

Whatever the possibilities of novelty in the divine experience, I do not believe that novelty in history is necessarily novelty in the thought, feeling, or will of God. I still believe there is truth in the words of Scripture, "*Before Abraham was, I am.*" The philosophy of naturalism would seem to me to compel a revision of these words until they read, "*Before Abraham was, much of Me wasn't.*" Instead of the familiar description, "God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake unto the fathers by the prophets," we should have to say, "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake unto the fathers, has grown up now and has a different story to tell." I cannot conceive the God of Jesus as



merely the God of Joshua, who has had a chance to learn some things and has decided, for example, that the cross is a better weapon than the sword.

Whatever novelty there may be in God must, it seems to me, lie in the realm of experience, not of character. It is the character of God, not the episodes in God's encounter with the race, that constitutes the meanings that are the subject matter of revelation. The episodes may give the meaning a "local habitation and a name," but the meaning was before and would have been if the episodes had not occurred. The character shines through the episodes. The shining may be a novelty to the seeing human mind but not to God. It was always there ready to break through. Only man's awareness of it is new.

If God was there *before* history, God is *beyond* history. His appearance *in* history is an appearance *to* history. Or if there is in God that which is not yet in history, then what difference does it make whether we say the newly communicated phase of God "breaks into" history or "breaks out within" history? If we give God and history their own identities, whatever present relations may exist between them, then anything more of God that appears within history is a breaking through the ontological boundary between the inexhaustible plentitude of God and the finite poverty of history. To say, as Morrison does, that such a conception "lifts the acts of God to a vacuous realm beyond history" seems to me to be insupportable. Any realm where God is, is not vacuous any more than a realm where is a history that includes God is vacuous. God minus history is still God!

I have said so much in order to recognize but also to discount the fury in some theological bosoms over the use of the preposition "to" whenever anyone talks about what happens in the relation between God and history. I frankly believe that the dynamic bifurcation of reality is not between the known and the unknown, but between what is known and what is unknowable save as the Unknowable initiates both the action in which His hitherto unknown character expresses itself and the movement within the mind which encounters the action and appraises it.

That encounter is what I mean by the experience, whose meaning is the content of revelation.

It may be an encounter with nature—the flower in the crannied wall, the glory in the night sky, a sunset, the unintelligible immensity of the astronomical universe. One may have passed them by many times. One

may have pondered structure and mystery. But one day they begin to mean something. They are not any longer merely themselves—flower, star, flaming sky, the sidereal vast—they are something else, too. One begins to say, "This is God." "This means God."

Tennyson holds the flower in his hand, but it is more than a flower now:

"Flower in the crannied wall,  
 . . . . If I could understand  
 What you are root and all and all in all  
 I should know what God and man is."

Canon Raven looks upon a blazing Western sky and it becomes an apocalypse; "for a moment the eternal reality behind the things of sense became unveiled." Some Hebrew long ago had a moment when the heavens became the voice of the glory of God. A modern scientist, knowing so much more than the ancient stargazer about the structure and behavior of sun and stars, echoed nevertheless that same awareness of meaning when he said, "The undevout astronomer is mad." All of them were seeing with new eyes what had often before imposed itself upon their vision. The phenomenon was familiar, even commonplace; the purport was fresh and arresting. Lewis's supernaturalism wisely admits what Barth's repudiates when he says, "Creation is revelation in the rough."<sup>2</sup> Temple affirms, too: "All things are grounded in the divine volition. All, therefore, is alike revelation." It seems to me that it would be better to say that creation or nature is one aspect of human experience which *may become a revelation if the mind of man is quickened to the realization of its meaning.*

The experience may be what we call an event or a series of events, a drought, a deliverance, the fall of Nineveh, the collapse of Jerusalem, a king's decree. But whatever it be, it finds on the human scene a man to whom the event has a deeper significance than his contemporaries dream. He, too, says, "This is not merely drought or deliverance or disaster or royal decree, this is God." "The drought means that we are sinners!" "The deliverance assures us that we have a mission!" "The disaster shouts that we are under divine judgment!" "The royal decree means that God means something else than our easy assumption." The *meaning* was often misinterpreted. But the *meaningfulness* of the event was recognized. Often the interpretation was such that a permanent treasure was added to

<sup>2</sup> *The Philosophy of the Christian Revelation.*

the growing riches of man's knowledge of God. Elijah and Isaiah, the psalmist and the prophet, the authors of Ruth and Job and Jonah, were not merely commentators who comforted or challenged their contemporaries. They were sensitive souls whose proclamation of the meaning of God in human experience has not been annulled by later affirmations of the centuries. Temple joins their company when he affirms God in the career of Syria and Israel. So does Lewis when he claims the presence of the Word of God in "the clash of warring forces amid which Jerusalem gradually ceased to be," and in Jeremiah's appraisal of the destruction of Jerusalem as a means of furthering God's purpose. So consents Morrison when he sees the hand of God "in every homely event in our most intimate experience."

Sometimes the experience in which men awake to meaning is with a person. Remember David's experience with Nathan. What was a human rebuke becomes a divine voice. David no longer cringes before a human accuser, but bows under a divine judgment, "Against thee and thee only have I sinned." *Supremely has the experience been with the Person!* The men who lived with Jesus and the men who meditated upon Him came to an hour when they said: "This is not merely a carpenter's son; this is God. His birth was an Incarnation. His words were the Word of God. His death was the sacrifice of God. His self-communication after death was the renewed activity of the God whose manifestation made a manger the cradle of God." Not everybody said that or had any intimation of it. If men had, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory. Many who were aware did not know what to make of it all. Their interpretation dishonored their impression. The meaning was often muddled in an attempt to relate it to a familiar philosophy or sociology or theology. But the meaning was the divine, the eternal aspect of the experience which gave it claim to be a revelation. That it did not become a revelation often was due to the inadequacy of the soul which was awakened to its presence. God was in Christ—in the meaning if not in the doctrine by which men interpreted the meaning.

I should like to dwell here for a moment. *What Is Christianity?* is a very stimulating book. We are all indebted to its author for his challenging presentation of the place of the community in revelation. But I must confess that he seems so to submerge Jesus in the historical community, so to make Him its consequence rather than its creator, that there is scarcely enough of a person left to be a meaning. "His values were

given to Him, His hopes were given to Him, His mission was given to Him, but He found them in the historical continuum of which He was born. It would be more accurate to say they found Him" (p. 89). If I understand the author there, Jesus was really only a focus of community values and hopes. To be sure, Doctor Morrison makes the community itself the revelation of God since it was the creation of God. But how can God create a community except through persons? If God created the community through His action upon persons, why not by His action upon *the Person*? Why not give Jesus the priority which faith has always given Him? Why locate the revelation in the community rather than in the Person? Is a community anything more than the common field of the persons who belong to it? Was not Jesus the dominant person in the action which changed a Jewish community into a universal community? Is not *He* the revelation, rather than the *community*—if choice must be made?

To be sure, it is a false antithesis. Jesus was the act of God. The community came into being as the result of the act of God in Him; and as the result of the acts of God, the Holy Spirit, upon those who became members of the community; and as the result of the interaction between the act of God in Jesus and the acts of God, the Holy Spirit, upon them directly. My passion is that we shall not lose Jesus in the community. If we do we shall lose His meaning and His supreme significance for history.

Sometimes the experience of meaning was mystical in form. It would be difficult, for example, to isolate the event out of which came the meaning which found its interpretation in ethical monotheism. It seems to me that Temple is again to be heeded when he declares: "This certainly is not an inference from experience." . . . "It was an illumination arising from communion with God in the activity of conscience and adoration" (p. 318). That will be questioned by those who believe that mystical experiences are wholly without objective reference or poetic value. The clearest, simplest answer to that doubt with which I am familiar, is to be found in D. Elton Trueblood's book on *The Knowledge of God*, and especially in the chapter on "The Logic of Objective Reference." These mystical experiences do have meaning, and it is a meaning that refers to God. Consequently it is possible for me to believe that long ago a man had, in an hour of meditation, something happen to his total selfhood

which compelled him to look beyond his perceptions and inferences and raptures and awe to God and say: "This is more than perception, more than inference, more than rapture and more than awe. This means God." Interpreting that meaning, He went out to proclaim, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord your God is one Lord." The experience and interpretation alike were community-conditioned to be sure, but not community-originated nor community-determined. *There is a community that includes God and the individual as well as other human individuals.* It is in that community also that meanings arise, are perceived and interpreted.

All that we commonly mean by value experience may also be the scene of new meanings which have at the same time a cosmic reference. Men suddenly begin to question old habits and customs, the slaying of an enemy, the economic exploitation of the weak, the spoliation of the poor, the indulgence of passion, the "lolling on ivory couches" and other familiar exhibitionisms of the playboys of wealth, the scorn of the gentile and "lesser breeds without the law." A new type of conduct dawns—mercy instead of vengeance, justice instead of tyranny, charity instead of oppression, self-control instead of lust and drunkenness, service instead of exploitation. "This," they said, "is righteousness, but this also is God. That is what this moral insight is—not merely a new social etiquette, but a new vision of God."

Men had an experience of beauty, beauty of sound, of form, of color; that intense, unique, exhilarating experience so aptly characterized by the author of *Men's Creatrix*, "In a moment we receive that which perfectly satisfies us." Beauty is not goodness, but it is good. It is not truth, but one who experiences it is likely to feel that he has stumbled upon a great truth of reality hitherto missed. Beauty is beauty itself and not another. Yet the experience of beauty has seemed to mean something profoundly, something very much more than itself. More than one soul has said, "This means God." If more men had said that, the fearful caricatures of God which have debased religion could never have arisen. The "beauty of the Lord our God" is for some the meaning of a rich and a widespread human experience.

Man himself has become, to some at least, a meaning. When it first dawned on man that he himself was what Lewis calls "a pointer reading," we do not know. It has been impossible to find any race of men who have not looked at themselves and then looked away to God. The belief in

God apparently has never been something which has had to be *inserted* into minds where it is not. Rather has it been a corollary of man's belief in himself which, when it becomes vivid and explicit, is simply a belief that has "come home." The myth of Genesis and the rhapsody of the psalmist, "Thou madest him a little lower than the angels," and the affirmations of the philosopher that mind here means mind there, all belong to the age-old awareness of meaning in man which refused to accept man as dust returning to dust. Many who scornfully or mournfully deny meaning to nature, and who find no meaning in history itself, have been overwhelmed with a meaning in themselves which is greater than the starry heavens and an answer to the blackouts of history. Their very capacity for spiritual life has made them dream of a Spirit Eternal in whose fellowship is life now and forever.

Finally, those experiences, which are as old and widespread as the race, experiences of moral salvation wherein evil habits are suddenly sloughed off, base emotions purged away, besetting sins robbed of their power and the soul, leaving its "low-vaulted past," enters into more stately mansions, have taken on meaning beyond the moral emancipation itself. Follow Underhill around the world in his "Conversions, Christian and Non-Christian," and everywhere men are saying after their moral emancipation, their self-transcendence, "This is God." The doxology of Paul, "More than conquerors through Him that loved us" has been heard in many lands. Regeneration has to multitudes meant a Regenerator.

That, it seems to me, is an empirical description of what has happened. Experiences new and old, familiar and strange, commonplace and eerie, have gradually or suddenly become pregnant with meaning. Sometimes that meaning has been interpreted as a call for a new ethic; sometimes, as a demand for a new theology. Sometimes it has become to men a revelation as what God is and what God has done; sometimes a clue to what man is, what he must do, what he may become.

This awakening to the meaning of experience has not been merely passive. Something has been given. But something also has been striven for, pondered, appropriated. The stark antithesis, so often insisted upon, between revelation and discovery does not seem to me to exist.

The experience, in the midst of which the new meaning arises, is one in which man himself has been a co-creator. It is not a purely external event. If it were, it would not be an *experience*. Things are, whether I



am aware of them or not. But unless I am aware of them things do not exist *for me*. My awareness of their existence is partly the result of their action, partly the result of mine. Things do act. Man is never the discoverer and the manipulator of a passive, inert world that would leave him alone if he let it alone. The world thrusts itself upon him. But man is never the mere *object* of the world's action either. Man is also *subject*; the world is his object. He shares in the creation of every experience. Whether it be an experience of nature or of people, action or mystic inaction, fact or value, reason or intuition, man is both receiver and giver, subject and object.

Nor does the meaning arise spontaneously within the experience. Nor is it thrust upon the experiencer. If there were no concern, question, reflection, there would be nothing but the flow of experience, a succession of impressions, a continuous tyranny of sensations and impulses, mere chemico-bio-psycho reactions to environment. *Meaning dawns where man means to do something to his world.*

And these meanings, which for want of better terms I have called "*ultimate*," begin to appear when man becomes serious about what is happening in his world of experience. *Intuition* follows observation, reflection, criticism, experiment. *Moral insight* appears when man employs all his own resources to discover the way of life for himself and his fellows. The *creative minorities*, which have been the life of every growing civilization, have always been those who are agitated enough about society to withdraw from its turmoil in order that they might in exile summon all their powers to the solution of society's problems. No withdrawal and no wrestling, no creative analysis and synthesis. *Mystical vision* makes heavy demands upon the self, as anyone knows who has read Evelyn Underhill's exhaustive volume. "We are apt to underestimate the human side" of revelation, the "condition of aspiration," "receptivity," says Walter Horton truly enough in his essay in the symposium on Revelation. Remember what the philosophers have said all along concerning the condition of insight. Helvetius declared only aristocratic souls could find it; Aristotle said it was the privilege only of free souls; the Stoics pronounced it to belong only to the wise; Fichte said, "Live the blessed life and you shall receive the blessing." All of them were saying that revelation is not the experience of the unconcerned or the unprepared; that it is also the result of a quest.

If revelation is an awakening to the ultimate meanings of experience,



it must be recognized that both the experience and the awakening involve man's activity. Neither experience nor meaning is something let down from heaven into an empty inert mind. But apparently effort alone cannot command meaning. The history of man's search is often as pathetic as the legend of the miner who has sought for gold in vain and whose frustration is reflected in his death song, "There's a gold mine in the sky far away, we will find it, you and I, some sweet day."

The experiences, which have ultimate meaning for some, do not for others. *Nature* to some means a machine slowly running down. *Events* are accidents, or the results of forces moving in uniform patterns, or the manifestations of human ignorance and depravity. *Man* is merely what Carlyle called a "forked animal" who thinks he thinks but really only invents reasons for not thinking. *The mystic* is a narcissus mistaking his own reflection for the presence of Another. *Values* are merely satisfactions of conditioned wants in the chemico-bio-physical organism. Neither beauty nor goodness have any cosmic significance. *Salvation* is a psychological accident which points nowhere except to the deluded victim. Even *Jesus* was a creature of His time, an apocalyptic visionary whose career tells us nothing worth knowing about the universe or the way to get along with it. So runs the sad tale of failure to perceive the meanings which are clues to God and destiny.

What means this absence of meaning? If it is not because of man's indifference, then it must be because other necessary factors are not present.

Thirty years ago psychologists were talking about the "apperceptive mass." What we find in any experience depends upon what we bring to it. To him that hath shall be given. All the thoughts, all the emotions, all the habits, all the resolutions and irresolutions, loyalties and disloyalties, obedience and disobedience of all our yesterdays are with us as we enter any experience of today. They determine what we shall see or fail to see in it. *A man like Caiaphas could not see God in Jesus*. His past had rendered him incapable of any such apprehension of meaning.

But that is far from being the whole story. The apperceptive mass of the individual is not created in a vacuum. It grows in a community and is affected by the community. That is the measure of truth in Morrison's contention that "revelation cannot be perceived and received except by members of a community which is itself the revelation" (p. 53). I do not agree that the community is the revelation. The community has a

meaning undoubtedly, and that meaning, when rightly interpreted, may become a revelation. Certainly the community does give a definite orientation to the individual. It develops interest or lack of interest, awareness or dullness, and thereby it may make possible or impossible that awakening to meaning which is revelation. Edwin Lewis gives recognition to the conditioning influence of the community when he says: "The Church becomes the instrument of the spirit . . . the Church is the final interpreter of the Word of God, and in particular is it the final interpreter of the relation in which Christ stands to its own life and action" (p. 31). By the Church he means those who have surrendered to Christ, the community of those illumined by the Spirit. Certainly such a community would greatly enrich the apperceptive mass of the individual and would render him sensitive to and capable of apprehending and interpreting meanings which he never could in isolation or in a totally different society.

But the possibility of another factor must be considered and is here affirmed—the direct quickening of the individual by the Divine Spirit. "The essential condition of revelation," says Temple, "is the coincidence of divinely controlled events and minds divinely illumined to read it aright." Or, to revert to the phraseology of this paper, the meaning may be present, there may be a mind on quest of meaning and sensitized for its quest by the community's life, but unless the God, who is present in the meanings, is also operative in the experiencing mind, the meaning will not be discerned. D'Arcy insists that the natural man is like a blind man and has a blind man's contact with God. I concur. Berdyaev puts it, Revelation is a catastrophic transformation of consciousness."

This, then, is the form of what we call revelation; history replete with meaning-bearing experiences; man awakening to the meaning; that awakening ensuing upon his own discipline, the influence of his community, the illumination of the Eternal Spirit. Some would add to "the awakening to meaning" the "interpretation of meaning" and insist that the interpretation, divinely guided, is the revelation. But interpretations have often been mistaken. They are, what Temple calls, ideas of revelation, not the revelation itself. They are Scripture. They are theology. They are ethical systems. He would be very hardy who would in the light of history, call them "the revelation." Revelation lies in meaning and in awareness of meaning.

# Australia's Place in the World Conflict

GEORGE STEWART

**A** STRANGER visiting Australia is impressed with her immediate task, her resources, her present effort in the critical emergency which has challenged the existence of the Empire, and, most of all, with her people.

The magnitude of Australia's task is more apparent as one views this vast island continent, only a little smaller than the United States. Here, in land twenty-five times the size of Great Britain and Ireland; composing one-fifth the land area of the Empire, with a coast line of over eleven thousand miles, a nation still essentially agricultural, is equipping an Army, a Navy and an Air Force which is abreast of the finest fighting services in the world.

Australia's war problems are made difficult for several obvious reasons. Geographically, she is in a far different position than the United States—the white-man's country which she most nearly resembles in point of land area. Whereas we have a grid of east-west and north-south railways, air lines and paved highways, she has only one transcontinental railway running east to west paralleling the southern coast. And no direct north and south railway at all. The interior is a vast land of grazing and semi-desert where lonely squatters and station keepers still maintain a life similar to our own frontier in the days of the Pony Express. Distances are immense, and, in the central regions, communications are scarce or non-existent, save for recent air lines and the amazing new Flying Doctor Services installed by the Australian Inland Mission. Nearly 40 per cent of the country is within the tropics. Rainfall averages from five inches in the dry area to two hundred inches in the rich tropical Queensland, in the eastern coastal region.

The sparseness of her population, a condition which has been faced with wide-open eyes by her leaders in an attempt to build a unique white civilization in the Asiatic area, makes for special hazards in a time of world brigandage. Valuable vacant land fit for settlement, with a dangerously small group to defend it, is a tempting prize to nations with flimsy ethical inhibitions. Australia is the Naboth's vineyard of the East.

Another disadvantage in the present war has been the small industrial assistance she has been able to receive from England, due to the preoccupation of English industry with the pressing war needs at home. Whereas in the last war and in normal times, machine tools, gauges, dies and jigs were shipped out from specializing factories, now Australia must herself create nearly the whole apparatus for manufacturing, especially since "Dunkirk." In this she is proving adept and has, in fact, sent sizeable quantities of munitions to the mother country. Steadily, week by week, the inventive and scientific skill of a small industrial plant is overtaking its handicap and increasing its output. Only a short time ago the government decided to create an armored division, the equal of any of Hitler's Panzer Divisions. The enormous war job which has come to the Australian people is being handled grimly and without boasting, with a growing, effective and deadly momentum. Sidi-Barrani, Bardia, Benghazi, Greece, Crete, Syria have tested the mettle of these men. They are the true sons of the Anzacs of Suvla Bay, Gez Tepé and the contested slopes of Gallipoli and the Somme.

Australia's natural resources are formidable and varied. Although she is still in the infancy of her industrial development, since the last war her plant has expanded at an accelerated rate. The present conflict, by necessity, has hastened that process to an astonishing degree. Factories, electric power, munitions works, steel mills, processing plants, the reduction of oil from shale, all give evidence of inventive, engineering and administrative ability of the first order.

However, Australia is still a country basically organized around agricultural products, wool, meat, fruit, wheat, dairy products, sugar, with mining and manufacturing—especially in the heavy industries—coming to the fore. With many consumer countries overrun, with shipping jeopardized, and with her own increased needs, Australia's ample material resources are undergoing strain, but are proving adequate. Her greatest present lack naturally is in foreign credits due to a loss in markets.

Advanced in social legislation to an extent which would terrify an American conservative, she has nevertheless not adopted conscription for her overseas forces. But there has been no shortage of volunteers enlisting for the fighting services. To July, 1940 (recruiting was suspended soon after; it is now about to be resumed), 90,000 men enlisted in A. I. F., whereas in the Great War in the same period the enlistments were for all

fighting services, army, navy, and air, 96,000. Enlistments for the first ten months of the present war numbered 121,230. In the summer of 1940 in the black days following the French *débâcle*, 41,132 young men crowded the recruiting offices in June. The greatest enlistment in any one month of 1914-1918 was 36,575. The air arm has laid the same spell upon Australia's youth as in Britain and in the United States. Thousands of the pick of the land are in the R. A. A. F., many are flying in England, others are training in Canada and Rhodesia. Still others are finding their courses of training in the numerous well-equipped air fields at home. Picked squadrons are flying in the African campaign and in Syria. Another especially distinguished squadron has given service in Coast Guard and convoy duty in England.

The figures on employment in war industries are even more striking. Whereas in the last World War, 2,737 were engaged in direct war manufacture, it is estimated that by July of this year, 150,000 will be so engaged. Over 15,000 of these early offered themselves for combat service, but were refused on the ground that essential war work should not be weakened.

The Australian Imperial Army, the A. I. F., now has well over 120,000 in its ranks, with a militia of over 200,000 men who have received combat training, a force which is constantly growing. Each man called up for militia training in the home defense troops retains the privilege of volunteering for overseas service in the A. I. F. There are now twenty-two A. I. F. and thirty-six militia camps where intensive training is going forward.

The Royal Australian Navy flashed into the headlines in July of last year when the cruiser *H. M. A. S. Sydney* in a Mediterranean action sunk the fastest cruiser afloat, the *Bartolomeo Colleoni*. But this dramatic action was only a part of the constant and heavy duties which have fallen upon this small but efficient fleet co-ordinated with the British Navy. Her ships not only assist in the Mediterranean campaign, convoy A. I. F. contingents, seek out Axis shipping and raiders in the Pacific and Indian Oceans as well as in the vast complex of islands to the north between Australia and the mainland of Asia, but also maintain naval defense of the extensive coast line of their home country. Australian-made armaments have defensively equipped over two hundred merchant vessels, fitted out thirty naval auxiliaries and five merchant cruisers, provided stores and fuel at strategic localities, arranged War Signal Stations, and in her yards has completed numerous new destroyers and other naval vessels. Many other units

are now building. To the navy falls also the tasks of controlling all British shipping in Australian waters, the examination of all merchant vessels and the maintenance of a Coast Watching Organization, including hundreds of highly trained volunteer civilians.

But the most impressive thing one meets in this varied and interesting continent is its people. The Australians are different from the people of all other white nations, even though they possess many similar characteristics. They are like and unlike their English, Scotch, Irish and Welsh forebears. Language, blood, religion and tradition they possess in common. But Australians have a different look, a different flavor to speech and ideas, a different inner life. In the last World War when one saw Australian soldiers, even without their picturesque digger hats turned up on one side, it was easy to distinguish them from the Springboks of South Africa, the yeomanry of the North Country, the London territorial, the native Scot or Irishman. Lean, tough bodies, deep-set eyes with crow's-feet in the corner due to long squinting in harsh sunlight; a certain hard-bitten, hatchet-faced grimness places them apart from other Empire troops. This is more easily understood by Americans if we compare the New Englander or a man from the Old South with the long-legged, sun-baked Texan on whom climate and soil and manner of life have wrought some subtle change of body and character.

The outsider searching for a clue to Australian character may well find it in the presence of the frontier, which wrought so profound an influence upon our American cultural, economic and spiritual life. Although over half the population live in towns and cities, still the thought-life of Australian people is deeply tintured by the danger, the loneliness, the slowness of communication, the drama and the tragedy of a frontier which has lasted, and will last, several generations beyond our own.

The Australian frontier has worked into the soul of the people, a certain slowness to be aroused, an ability to take hardships, a tenacious pride of race, spiritual resilience under defeat, free and hospitable manners, a love of combat once begun and a gay abandon in battle. Battles in North Africa and Syria are showing again the mettle of boys from isolated inland stations and town-bred students, who are strangely alike under their skins.

Australia's greatest asset is not her orchards, sheep stations, mines, dairy and wheat farms, her immense undeveloped lands, or her growing factories, but her sons and daughters. All old families have their beginnings



in men and women whose ox teams carried them to remote spots, where, amid silence, drought, flood and terrific isolation, they grew up with the country. In every school the history is necessarily the tale of exploration, heroism, tragedy and enough success to make it all valuable. In every club the old portraits are of men who have put thousands of miles behind them on horseback. Churches, universities and hospitals were founded by those who have lived in the bright face of danger and hardship. Although the frontier is now out of sight in the great cities and rich farming districts of the coast, it is only a few hundred miles distant, and, spiritually, it is always present.

Here, as in America, the women have played an equal part with the men in the building of the nation. In the early days, and even now in the immense inland, women rear and teach their children without schools, have little chance to see other women, are alone on the land during months or weeks when their men are driving cattle or sheep, and endure all the hazards that fall to women who know how helpless they would be in case of grievous illness or accident without medical care near at hand. The woman on the lonely station has had a profound influence upon the life of the Australian people. She is largely unsung, here or elsewhere, but without her the land would never have been settled. And in war as in peace, her efforts have continued. In fact, in all branches of combat service women have found their place as nurses and specialized assistants. Although Australian women have not been subjected to front-line conditions as have the women of Britain, they have come forward in impressive numbers at every call for workers.

Leadership in the churches of Australia is intelligent and well trained. It has that wide vision of Christendom and of the world's needs held by the most enlightened churchmen of Europe and America, centering in the International Missionary Council, the World Council of Churches, and the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches.

The four largest denominations are the Anglican, the Presbyterian, the Methodist and the Catholic. All four are carrying forward home and foreign mission work and are represented by thriving churches in the large cities such as Brisbane, Sidney, Melbourne, Adelaide, Perth, and Hobart in Tasmania.



The spirit of unity among Protestant denominations received a tremendous impetus at the Oxford and the Edinburgh Conferences in 1939. This is directly reflected in negotiations which look forward to the union of Methodists and Anglicans, or of the Presbyterians and Anglicans. Any such merger would be a great help, especially at the point of theological training. At present theological seminaries are small and could give better training for the ministry if faculties could be organically united. In the past, many of the higher clergy have been brought out from England or Scotland. With the Australian educational system reaching its maturity, there will probably be less of this in the future.

The Church has not neglected this important matter of religious education and of education in general. For in every large town and city one will almost inevitably find a Church of England, a Methodist, a Presbyterian, and a Catholic Ladies College, which correspond to our best private girls' schools. The same applies to boys' schools. Not only have secondary schools claimed the interest of the Churches, but also higher education. Around each of the secular state universities are the residential colleges of the churches. Nearly all of them have some tutorial work co-ordinated with the university curricula.

Social work institutions have been largely founded by churches and are now supported by them. Orphanages, family welfare societies, adoption agencies, kindergartens, boys' and girls' clubs, and social settlements following the American pattern are maintained by single parishes or by combinations of church people.

Foreign mission work has reached out to India, Africa, Malaya, Burma, Fiji, New Guinea, and other regions. The personnel, in training and ability, equal the best of any sending country, embracing doctors, teachers, nurses, shop-work trainers, translators, and preachers.

The great field of home-mission work is in the small towns, or in the Inland, where through the heroic work of John Flynn, the Flying Doctor Service has been established. This stands out as the greatest piece of medical home mission work in the world today. The bush-radio pedal sets enable even a child to talk with radio bases at Cloncurrie, Alice Springs, Wyndham, Broken Hill, Calgoorlie, and Port Hedland, connecting up the hospital and Flying Doctor Service. Although the work of the Australian Inland Mission was initiated by the Presbyterian Church, the

Flying Doctors made so large a general appeal that the Australian Aerial Medical Service was inaugurated to care for their specialized work. It has enabled men to take their wives and children into the interior, an area as large as the Mississippi Basin.

By industry and vision, Australia has grown. She has now developed to a place where she dare face today's crisis with a competence and calm worthy of a larger nation. To a small people, not more in number than the population of New York City, has fallen the job not only of defending herself against possible attacks from Japan and from German raiders who prey upon her commerce, but also of sending timely and formidable aid to the homeland and other units of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Australia did not want this war, any more than did England or South Africa or New Zealand or the United States. But, now that it has come, she is giving herself for victory, but not forgetting the pressing problem of reconstruction which will crowd upon every government when "Cease fire!" has sounded.

The Australians know, as we know in our hearts, that this is no ordinary war, no war to save British wealth, English pride or Empire power. It is a world war being waged in every street, in every city, within every human heart. It is a choice between an exaggerated collectivism, dominated by a few men who have set themselves up in place of God, who are set to destroy every political and social gain of a thousand years, and a concept of freedom based on duty which all of us have often neglected, but which holds the only valid hope for mankind. Australia knows she must, with all friends and the Empire, win the war or accept "chains and slavery."

## Religion and Health

RUSSELL L. DICKS

**B**ASICALLY the problems of religion and health are the age-old problems of the body and soul. They are complicated in our day by conditions of modern life and by the professions that are at work in the field, chief of which are the medical profession, the clergy, the social worker, and the public health nurse. The subject of religion and health is stirring itself alive and taking on new forms. Like anything newly come alive it has grave dangers.

### NEW SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SUBJECT

As the National Christian Mission worked itself across the country last year this subject of religion and health came more and more alive. In some instances it was the setting up of new trains of thought, in others a crystallizing of ideas that were already germinating, in all it was a matter of striking at deep human needs which were going untouched. The seminar on Religion and Health was second in popularity only to International Problems and in a few cities it stood first in attendance.

Four years ago a survey of the Episcopal clergy of Connecticut showed this subject to stand first in their interest. The Episcopal clergy have long been alert to the implications of religion and health. It is noteworthy that the three most significant workers in this field until of recent date in America have all been Episcopalians: Elwood Wooster in Boston, Franklin Cole Sherman in Cleveland, and John Gaynor Banks on the West Coast. Interest in the subject among the Episcopal clergy ranges from the practice of saying a few prayers over the sick with the hope that the patient will arise and take up his bed, to a willingness to adequately study and carefully investigate the field to discover how religion can aid health.

Clergy of other denominations are now becoming interested in the subject. Here, too, we find the interest varied, with a greater tendency to follow the mental hygiene leaders, for most of the clergy are a little frightened at the thought of God using them directly to bring about a healing of the miracle type. It is safer to preach. In the pulpit one has a

two-and-a-half-foot advantage and a running start in case miracles start happening. However, all have been humbled, agitated and annoyed by the increasing desertion of their people to Christian Science. And many have stories to tell, by way of preserving their self-respect, of burying former members who left the fold for Christian Science. Some honestly and humbly admit that had their people received the "living water" in their own churches they would never have had to seek it elsewhere. In fairness it must be said that the Protestant clergy is teachable upon the subject of religion and health and eager for any help it can receive, although a little weak on faith, probably owing to lack of information about material the medical profession has been turning up during the last fifteen or twenty years. This eagerness is indicated by the way the clergy buys books upon the subject of mental hygiene, psychiatry, counseling, and working with individuals. Unfortunately they buy the good, bad and indifferent alike, depending upon the advertising of the publishers and the advice of their own booksellers, both of whom have been ill-advised again and again. The Protestant clergy in general is only slightly ahead of the laity in its knowledge and concern about the subject of religion and health. And the theological seminaries are far behind the clergy in their recognition of the subject's significance; for its significance is basic and reaches far beyond a few paralytics walking or a few blind seeing.

Behind the general stirring in this field is the medical profession and its investigation, not the religionists. These are simply trying to exploit the finding of medical observers, most of whom have not made their investigation available because they are not satisfied with their observations. When Dr. Alexis Carrel writes in his book, *Man, the Unknown*,<sup>1</sup> of prayer healing cancer, he writes as a prophet and not as a scientist. If he reported a hundred cases, if he carefully described the conditions under which his observations had been made, if other investigators were able to duplicate his results, then his claim would be accepted by his own profession, and prayer would increasingly come to be the prescribed medical treatment for cancer in addition to surgery, even if the results were but twenty per cent favorable. Until that happens medical science will continue to treat cancer with surgery, where the results are far above twenty per cent.

It is commonplace for the general medical practitioner to say that from fifty to ninety per cent of the people who come to his office have

<sup>1</sup> Harper & Brothers, 1935.

problems which are not of an organic nature—that is, problems of the soul. The general practitioner is not a careful investigator. He faces the practical problem of having to help many people quickly. But when so many admit this condition, it may be accepted as being true even if the claim is not based upon careful records. (The difference between fifty and ninety per cent is simply that one physician is more helpful and patient with that kind of problem than another.) No one knows the number of persons who become ill with definite organic disease because of emotional difficulties. I have known six people who died without good pathological reasons according to statements by their physicians; but even here, when my interest was alert, my records are incomplete; the physicians talked behind their hands in making such a statement, fearful of what another member of the profession would say. They fear that it smacks a bit of quackery, so they don't speak where a brother physician might overhear. Even now psychiatry is the practice of treating "nuts" in the eyes of the general practitioner. To admit a person dies because her husband goes out with another woman or an officer in the church dies because his firm is indicted for crooked practices is to move into the realm of speculation where scientific methods cannot be used to check one's observations. Such claims are not in the medical books. Not yet, at any rate. These patients had organic disease, to be sure. They had surgical treatment. But others get well with far more serious disease which calls for more severe treatment. Some get well and others die with the same disease, receiving the same treatment, under the same conditions. Why? "Because some want to get well and others do not want to," would be the easy statement of the physician. What is it to want to get well and how does one come by such a desire? That is a fundamental question as religion is related to health.

I have often quoted the statement of Dr. Walter B. Cannon, Harvard physiologist. A friend once said to Doctor Cannon, "When you know all the diseases it's possible to have (something over a hundred and twenty-five), you wonder how anyone is ever well." Dr. Cannon, who knows as much about the human body as anyone alive, replied, "When you know a great deal about the human body you wonder why anyone is ever sick." Then why do we get sick? Because we have to live in our bodies, that's all. It is the wear and tear of the soul upon its place of habitation.

The psychiatrist asks his patient such questions as, "How do you

get along with your boss, your mother-in-law, your neighbor?" Strangely familiar questions; but Jesus spoke of "enemies." Perhaps His insight was more specific and His description more accurate than those who speak of their "neighbors" and "in-laws." The psychiatrist also asks: "What are your hopes in life? What would you like to do? Have you achieved the ambitions of your youth? In what do you have faith?" Those are questions religion deals with.

Psychiatry has been probing into the problems of the soul following the discoveries of Sigmund Freud and the psycho-analytic school. The psycho-analysts have not only been good observers, they have been articulate and aggressive propagandists. Psychiatric writers have added a few observations of their own and have popularized the subject of the soul, not bothering much about the body. Dr. H. Flanders Dunbar has worked at the task of studying the body and soul together. Her book, *Emotions and Bodily Changes*,<sup>2</sup> is a survey of the early medical writing in the field. It does not cover Doctor Dunbar's investigation. It must be said that psychiatry, more than any other branch of medicine, is responsible for the new rise of the subject of the body and the soul.

#### PRESENT TENDENCIES OF RELIGION AND HEALTH MOVEMENT

Christian Science had its rise because the medical profession refused to recognize that the body has a soul and because the clergy failed to recognize that the soul has a body. Christian Science simply occupied the gap between the organized forces working for religion on one side and health on the other. It is significant to note that most of the membership of the Christian Science church has been drawn from other churches, particularly the liberal Protestant churches. If we stir ourselves there is nothing of value that Christian Science has which we cannot gain for our people in our regular Protestant churches, unless it is the doing away with dull sermons. Perhaps therein we will never be as wise as the Christian Scientists who solve the problem by simply doing away with all sermons. But we must be alert or we will make the same tragic mistake that Christian Science made, namely, the throwing out of the medical profession. It is a common practice to give great credit to prayer and to make great claims for prayer in treatment of the sick. Many a person says, "Prayer

<sup>2</sup> *Emotions and Bodily Changes*, H. Flanders Dunbar, Columbia University Press, 1936, New York.



cured me," or "I got well because my friends were praying for me," irrespective of what medical treatment he was receiving. This kind of thinking, which may well become more general, is certain to do damage.

At present the religion and health movement is shaping up along three major lines. One is the mental hygiene emphasis; a second, which is more difficult to identify, may be called the supernatural or romantic emphasis; the third falls in between the other two and in general centers in the "clinical training for theological students" group.

The mental hygiene movement came into being following the publication of Clifford W. Beers's book, *A Mind That Found Itself*, in 1908. Beers was interested in improving the conditions of the mentally ill in mental hospitals. Modern psychiatry was barely upon the horizon; the first World War was to give it its great spurt forward. Many physicians and educators saw in the Beers organization a chance to spread their own ideas concerning mental health and behavior. Mental hygiene now claims as its field the whole of living; it is still under the influence of the medical profession, but educators have taken it over more and more. It is a propaganda movement with a message to sell, a message which becomes more and more vague because, as an educational movement, it is dependent upon others for its gospel, and that gospel is slow in forthcoming. Mental hygiene is interested in the Church only so far as the Church affords a channel for education. Its major emphasis is health; until recently this concern has been mental health, but as the close relationship between body and mind begins to appear, mental hygiene will more and more include physical health in its program also. As yet this trend is taking place slowly, probably because of the antagonism of the general medical practitioner.

Mental hygiene has no interest in religion as such, except to admit vaguely that religion may influence thinking and thus living. Most mental hygienists are inclined to look upon religion as taught in the Church as being a handicap to "right" thinking and therefore to "right" living, due to the inhibitions, fears, and sense of guilt it engenders in its adherents. "Right" for the mental hygienist is not a "moral rightness" as conceived by the religionist. It is interesting to observe that sound mental hygienists and sound religionists are quite close together when they describe the ideal society and ideal behavior. They use a different vocabulary, but

they agree when they are able to describe their vocabularies. They disagree upon their reasons for such behavior and their methods for achieving the ideal society vary considerably.

The limitations of mental hygiene, whether it deals with mental or physical health, to my way of thinking, are several. First, health for health's sake, which is life without meaning, is senseless. Philosophically it is an untenable position, and practicably it is an untenable position, as the psychiatrists tell us from their work with patients. The psychiatrist often works to "resolve the conflict," to help people accept the limitations of themselves and the conditions under which they live: to become contented cows. But people, many people, are not cows; they are people and they refuse to be cows. Those who are cows to begin with never seek a psychiatrist, for they have no sense of inadequacy.

I remember a psychiatrist saying: "I never have any luck with my little rich girls. There is no incentive; there is no 'root, little pig, or die.'" The average psychiatrist has no conception of the "kingdom of God," no figure on the cross, no understanding of a Divine restlessness. He has not the perspective of religion. Without such a perspective he has no ministry to the dying. And without a ministry to the dying his ministry to the living is but superficial and temporary, even though his patient is not facing an immediate death. People cannot dare to live until they can dare to die, and a philosophy that does not include death is not a philosophy that is adequate for life, for death is always in the background. It is the backdrop against which we do our little act. The clever actor never plays to the back curtain, but he is fully conscious of its being there.

Secondly, mental hygiene does not have a philosophy which includes a belief in the backing of the universe, or God, in the terms of religion. In a treatment relationship the therapist takes that place himself for all practical purposes, and I am not being sarcastic. I recognize the religionist does the same thing in a treatment relationship, but he can talk about it objectively when the time arises. The mental hygienist, who believes only in health for health's sake, cannot.

Thirdly, because he has no conception of a Universal Mind, the psychiatrist and mental hygienist does not have prayer as a method. We do not understand everything involved in prayer—how it works, and why; but we do know it is one of the most effective methods that has ever been discovered for strengthening morale and of relating a person to the

creative process of the universe. The mental hygienist cannot use prayer until he gains a perspective, until he develops a universe-philosophy. I do not say that he will not develop such a philosophy, but few mental hygiene and psychiatric writers, even the religionists who have gone into mental hygiene, have done so. When the religionist goes into the mental hygiene movement, he so often takes on its limitations rather than taking its strengths and combining them with the strengths of religion.

As I said above, it is more difficult to identify and describe the second main tendency in the religion and health movement. To say that there are people who emphasize the supernatural, and attempt to bring about health through the direct intervention of God, irrespective of the conditions or the personnel at work with a given patient, claiming complete credit for themselves in case of recovery, may be to do them an injustice; and yet that is true of their claims. There are many whose only interest in the problem of religion and health is to aid in the recovery of health through badgering God into performing a miracle. They take health very much for granted until it breaks down; in this they are correct. In fact, they often abuse health and belittle it before it breaks down; in this they are far from correct. Then given an instance of illness, regardless of its nature, they set about to recover health through prayer and exhortation. If health is recovered they claim it was due to their prayers; they give God little credit for having been at work before they arrived, and the physician and nurse, if they were at work, receive no credit whatsoever. It is this emphasis that makes the physician angry, not because he receives no credit, but because he sees too many people die when he is not called early enough, people with the same conditions that he has seen recover when treated earlier medically. In both instances prayer may have been used, but in the one where the physician was called early the patient recovered.

While the mental hygiene emphasis has its limitations, the romantic emphasis is particularly dangerous. Dr. Glenn Clark is one of those whose work and claims need careful examination. I am sure Doctor Clark does not do much harm in his actual work with people. But that he would do some harm is inevitable. This is true of every person working in the field of human personality, whether he is physician, social worker or clergyman. That he does a great deal of good is the testimony of both his friends and critics. His early books, particularly his little books of

inspiration, are helpful. Those in which he describes methods of meditation are very helpful to some people, but his vocabulary, his description of his method, his understanding of the needs of people, and his observation of their progress are inadequate. Many others working in the field have these limitations, but the claims that Doctor Clark makes in *How to Find Health Through Prayer*,<sup>3</sup> indicates clearly his failure to appreciate the value of the medical profession, and his lack of careful records.

Several eminent evangelists have become interested in the subject of religion and health; but they do not speak from their own observation. They quote medical observers. The dangers here are the dangers of anyone who attempts to popularize a field in which he has not been trained, disciplined and humbled by hours of weary work upon the subject. As popular speakers they address thousands of people, setting up hopes within them for help with their deepest problems. These people then look for further help, but the speaker who has stirred them has gone on to another city with more campaigns. They turn to the local clergy, with what results? The clergy themselves, with their prejudice against Christian Science, were as surprised as the laity when they heard this subject discussed. Most of them are but little better informed, and many of them need spiritual treatment as badly or worse than their prospective patients. When the laity make demands upon the clergy which the clergy cannot fulfill, the results may be disastrous for the Church.

The second grave danger these well-meaning clergy make in their approach to the subject of religion and health is that they have not thought through the part the medical profession is to play in the coming religion and health movement. They seem to visualize the doctor accepting Christ and thereafter using Christ and religion to serve health, which in turn will serve Christ. I know hundreds of both Christian and non-Christian physicians, and I venture to predict that this hope will not come true. Further, I am not at all sure that it is desirable. It is certainly desirable that physicians should accept Christ, but that in and of itself is not enough. I know many physicians who know little about Christ who serve their patients better than many Christian physicians.

If I have an appendix that is hot, I want a doctor who knows the anatomy of the abdomen and who is a skilled surgeon. If I have pulmonary tuberculosis, I want a physician who knows the pathology of the

<sup>3</sup> Harper & Brothers, 1940.

disease and how it should be treated. I also would like a doctor who knows enough about the soul to encourage me and to ask an expert of the soul to see me as he observes I need one, and to consult with that specialist as he consults with other specialists about less important parts of my being. I will not expect my physician to be a specialist upon all my needs. The soul and the body are so complicated that no single person can know enough about both to treat adequately either of them. Dr. Richard C. Cabot used to say: "When you are looking for a doctor and see a sign, 'physician and surgeon,' look for another doctor. No man can know enough to be both a medical man and a surgeon; he can be one or the other; he cannot be both." That labels great sections of the medical profession as being inadequate. Quite so. And we must avoid making the profession more inadequate by thrusting another major task upon its shoulders.

Between the mental hygiene and the romantic emphasis are a few comparatively unknown but persistent workers, products of the clinical training movement for theological students. This movement started in 1925 under Rev. Dr. Anton Boisen, at the Worcester State Hospital in Massachusetts. From there it spread to other mental hospitals. In 1933 Rev. Mr. Philip Guiles, who had formerly worked with Doctor Boisen, started in the New England hospitals under the Earhart Foundation. Doctor Boisen and the Council for Clinical Training, Inc., have worked primarily in mental hospitals, taking theological students into the hospital for training. Because of their work and their association with psychiatry, the leaders of the Council are largely mental hygienist in their outlook. They have done little to bridge the gap between psychiatry and religion either in thought or in method. However, several of their leaders now who are working in general hospitals are moving in that direction.

Due to the fact that Doctor Guiles and what has come to be called the New England School for Clinical Work shifted their clinic to general hospitals the students of the New England School have been free to develop their thought and experiment with methods in dealing with average people. The result is that the New England School is out in the lead in bridging the gap between the medical profession, and its findings, and the clergy with its philosophical-theological background. But there is still a long way to go before the gap can be said to be adequately bridged. These men, as are the men in other clinical work, under the Council for Clinical Training in New York, Philadelphia, and elsewhere, are keeping careful



records and experimenting; they are humble, disciplined and courageous, willing to recognize failure and to learn from it. Where there is such work there is hope for the future, which I would not believe if the future of the religion and health movement were left either to the mental hygienists or the romantic supernaturalists.

The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America has a Committee on Religion and Health, made up of outstanding physicians, clergy, and laymen, with one of the best products of the clinical-training movement serving as its executive secretary, the Reverend Seward Hiltner. The function of this Committee is to co-ordinate, encourage, popularize, and serve as a clearing house for the Church at large, upon work that is being done in the field. While members of the Committee may do experimental and pioneer work, the Committee as such serves other purposes, the major one being to preserve sanity in the midst of much insanity. For the problems of religion and health first appeared in the tribal medicine man and were exploited through his practices. Little progress has been made since that time so far as the claims and practices of many at work in this field are concerned.

#### A SLIGHT MATTER OF RECORDS

The difference between a quack and a sound worker in the field of religion and health, or spiritual adviser, is a slight matter of keeping records and of co-operating with other professional workers. The benefits of records are many,<sup>4</sup> chief of which is that they make it possible for the worker to know how he helps people, as well as giving him a chance to examine his failures. As Dr. Richard C. Cabot was fond of pointing out, the clergyman has no autopsy table. He can never examine his failures, his wrong guesses; he never accumulates objective evidence that may one day knock him down by its obviousness.

One can spot a person who works with written records by the way he talks about his work. He speaks as one with authority. He is human. His concern for his patients is acute. He is down to earth. The breath of life flows through his person and his speech. And above everything else, he is working at the problem of how he helps people. The quack helps people, sometimes when no one else can. No one knows quite how

<sup>4</sup> Chapter 18, *The Art of Ministering to the Sick*, Cabot and Dicks, 1936. The Macmillan Company, New York.



but we have some guesses. I would not minimize the helpfulness of the quack in given instances, but I would be afraid of him, for he is dangerous. He does not know what he is doing. A person could, after slight observation, get into a car and drive it a short distance without mishap, knowing very little about why it goes to the right or to the left, but I prefer to ride with a person who knows more than that about his tools. Cases have been reported of surgical operations at sea performed by laymen successfully, but most of us prefer a surgeon who has had more adequate training and who knows what to do and why he does it.

The method of medical science is trial and error, but it checks which treatment fails and which succeeds; through its literature and the collaboration of one physician with another the results of trials and errors are preserved and need not be repeated by every member of the profession. The practice of keeping records is the greatest sign of hope upon the horizon for religion and health. If you find your spiritual adviser does not keep records, flee from him as you would from a physician who does not read the medical journals.

#### MEDICINE AND RELIGION

"Medical science, psychiatry included, is a technique, a method, an instrument, for achieving a given end, namely, 'the prolongation of life and the alleviation of suffering.' It is not philosophic, nor concerned with the nature of living, nor the world in which it lives. . . . It is not a method of living, but an instrument or technique to aid living. . . . Medical science strives to gain and maintain health for its subjects; religion strives to put meaning into health. Medical science is interested in quantity of life; religion is interested in quality of living. . . . Religion attempts to describe the methods and direct the practices whereby quality in living, or the good life, may be achieved. . . . Religion traditionally has focused attention upon the God beyond the individual and has been concerned with relating the individual to that God, while the physician claims to know little about God. He focuses attention upon the individual himself. The physician is thus free from the overlord of judgment, but he also lacks the perspective which religion gives."<sup>5</sup>

In the book from which the above is quoted I have estimated that the clergy carries but some fifteen to twenty per cent of the spiritual needs of

<sup>5</sup> *Who Is My Patient?* Russell L. Dicks, from Chapter 2, 1941, The Macmillan Company, New York.

the sick, and I think even that is high. Obviously someone must meet these needs. The physician carries the larger part of the load, the nurse some, the medical social worker some, and friends and family carry some, the rest simply muddle through.

#### THE FUTURE OF RELIGION AND HEALTH

It is doubtful if the physician will take over the whole of the task even with those suffering from fear or a sense of guilt. If trends in caring for the sick had continued as they were going during the past twenty years the medical profession and possibly social service would have taken over the care of most of these problems, including the lonely in extreme instances. But the future looks different for the medical profession. There is a trend toward smaller fees, which means the doctor must see more patients; therefore he will not be able to deal with spiritual needs, because of the time required. Also there is the trend toward increasing socialized medicine in one form or another. Then the medical profession will take on more and more the slovenly habits of work that the clergy, under socialized religion, follow.

That puts it pretty clearly up to the clergy. It must reclaim the treatment of spiritual needs it has forfeited. It has sufficient information. It has the teaching method. Both of these will be added to and modified as time goes on. It but awaits the setting up of teaching mediums, the training of more instructors, the continuing of research in the field. The medical profession will do the basic research but we must make our own adaptation. The psychiatrist can never describe the clergyman's work with his people; he forever sees the task as a psychiatrist; never as a clergyman, with his far view and his eternal hope for his people. The clergy must ultimately experiment and make its description, and it must keep its own records. It must eternally war against the quack as the physician has fought him in his profession. We know that the clergy's future in work with individuals is closely associated with that of the physician. If it goes off on its own it will follow the tragic trail of Christian Science.

The future is not bright, but it is not lost.

# The Search for Peace

HERBERT WELCH

**M**Y THESIS is that peace is not a miracle to be looked for on some bright spectacular morning, not a simple virtue to be cultivated by itself, not a realm to be suddenly entered as one turns some corner in history or a condition to be established by a mere act of the will or the stroke of a pen. Peace is a structure containing several essential parts, and only skill and patience and time can build it.

In any fruitful consideration of war and peace, we must begin by facing all the facts. Too often we are taught that war is the embodiment of all horrors and all evils, unmitigated by a gleam of light; and that peace is the idyllic state which includes all that is lovely and desirable in human life. But only frankness is necessary in order to modify that picture. War is not all evil and peace is not all good. Instead of stark black and white, our picture, if it is truly to represent reality, must be painted in many shades of gray. To say that war never accomplishes anything or that nothing but evil ever comes out of it is to fly in the face of the facts. Historically war has broken some old oppressions, has righted some persistent wrongs, and even though it had in itself no constructive power, it has at times cleared the ground and prepared the way for a new edifice. Our Revolutionary War and our Civil War alike were surely not without beneficial results.

Of course, we refuse to join with Hitler and Mussolini in their glorification of war as the essential builder of manhood and of national greatness, but they voice a truth, albeit with gross exaggeration, which we cannot ignore if we are to see life steadily and see it whole. War, while it brings its ghastly perils to personal character through abnormal conditions, while it rouses fear and suspicion and (usually) hatred and cruelty, does nevertheless lift a man above his personal and petty concerns, does appeal to loyalty and unselfishness and courage and comradeship and patience and endurance. Scientific invention is stimulated, which will later serve men in their peaceful pursuits. National unity may be promoted, as in the case of China, and a nation find itself almost in a day by the hard and well-nigh intolerable pressures of war.

Prof. G. K. Zipf of Harvard, in seeking the pattern of national health and drawing his harmonic curves, goes so far as to say: "The turmoil of war and strife are perhaps to be viewed primarily as the correctives and curves of maladjustments, rather than as their causes."

On the other hand, peace, by itself and in itself, is by no means the *summum bonum*. The evils of war are evident, but the perils of peace more insidious. Peace has its victories no less than war, but peace has also its dangers and its defeats. "War its thousands slays, Peace its ten thousands." Francis Bacon wrote long ago that "easy times, especially with peace and prosperity," are the cause of atheism. He could aptly have quoted the prayer of Agur the sage that he might not be given riches lest he be full and deny his Maker and say, "Who is the Lord?" That ease and softness and luxury and security may produce fat rather than muscle in the body of the nation, is proved true in modern as well as in ancient times. Witness the words of Marshal Petain on the fall of France. We must not forget that the evils which go so naturally with war are not wholly absent in peace. There is drunkenness and licentiousness and gambling and unbrotherliness even in the quietest times. War may make these outbreking ills more vivid, more dramatic, but beneath all is unregenerated human nature, which defies moral standards whether in war or in peace.

Like power, peace has its enchanting possibilities—but either may be perverted. We ask ourselves ever and anon, Can we be trusted with power? We do wisely to ask ourselves also whether we have attained that stability of character, that wisdom and self-control, which would make it safe to entrust us with peace so that it will not in its turn destroy us. Peace, if it is to fulfill its blessed mission, must not only be desired but deserved; it must be earned. It does not drop like the gentle rain from heaven upon the just and the unjust, but like wealth or health, it is the more precious if it is not easily acquired and will thus be valued more highly and used more wisely.

The peace of the pacifist, to be gained by mere abstention from fighting, is too easy, too simple. His thinking is apparently the outgrowth of two fundamental assumptions, neither of which will stand the test of critical examination. He overestimates the value of mere physical existence and consequently seems to regard death as the final disaster; and he insists that the method of violence is in plain contradiction of the

law of love, utterly ignoring God's use of violence, even to the destruction of human life, in the world of nature.

The time has come when we must not simply denounce war, but also study the causes of war; when we must not only desire peace, and pray for peace, and make treaties of peace, but also *build for peace*. The quick, the superficial, the temporary peace—we have had enough of that! If we are to have a genuine and a lasting peace, we must meet the hard conditions. Four factors at least will enter in. The temple of peace must rest upon four pillars.

First, *Freedom*. Man is created for freedom, and the love of freedom is inborn, deep and ineradicable. With growth in intelligence and self-respect, it becomes a passion. During the Korean Independence Movement, when some of us were asked to quell the revolt, we replied to the Japanese Minister of Education, "You yourself are responsible, you cannot keep a nation of slaves if you educate them."

But there are individuals and in some cases groups, which doubt or deny this truth. Can it be that they are right and we are wrong? It may be that we of the so-called "democratic nations" have believed a lie. It may be that the goal of history is a regimented order, a totalitarian state, a body of citizens efficiently organized not to think or to choose but only to obey. It may be that an army rather than a family is the model on which society should be constructed, and as for its units—"their's not to reason why, their's not to make reply, their's but to do and die"—a nation of robots, of mechanical toys, to be wound up and played with at the whim of "the powers that be." It may be that this is "the new order" which the world needs. But not one of us who loves liberty believes that for an instant. To have our thoughts, our plans, our speech, our reading, our education, our work, our love, our worship, all regulated by the State is intolerable to those who have been trained in freedom.

And what is true in a high degree of us is true in some degree of all. If there is to be stability, then the love of freedom, in the individual, in the class or caste, in the nation, must be satisfied. No one person, no one society or economic group, no one nation or race, can safely lord it over the rest. No people can be counted upon to be long content if kept subject. Beneath the crust of outward submission the fires burn. The spirit of Patrick Henry is still abroad: "Is life so dear, and peace

so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God!" Some may cry, "Peace, peace," but there is no genuine peace under those conditions. Military or economic strength may win temporary control, but subject nations, colonies, racial or religious minorities, are left restless and rebellious. If Japan *could* dominate China, such a victory would not stabilize peace in the Orient, but would only make certain future wars. In the nations whose sovereignty has been destroyed by Germany, the peace which has been proclaimed is no reality. The only satisfying and enduring peace must be based on freedom—individual, social, racial, national. Dictators may be useful for a passing emergency, but they have no promise of a future. The democratic right of self-determination—the right of each nation, large or small, strong or weak, to choose and to use its own form of government—and the right of each citizen to protection by that government in freedom of opinion, of speech, of assembly, of press, of occupation, of religion—this is the first guarantee of a stable and peaceful society.

Second, *Order*. Freedom is not absolute but relative, and freedom must always be exercised within the limits fixed by the rights of others. Complete, unrestricted freedom of the individual would lead to anarchy and chaos. When every man does that which is right in his own eyes, he is very sure to do some things which are not right in other people's eyes!

At the other extreme is the complete subordination of the individual to the State, which means despotism. The eternal problem with which we have to deal is how to reconcile the rights and desires of the individual with the welfare of the group. The basic difference in political controversy concerns the point at which the best compromise between anarchy and despotism is to be effected. Justice Felix Frankfurter in a recent decision of the Supreme Court has pointed out "that even a right so fundamental as religious liberty must be exercised in accord with other rights." We Americans have always sought the golden mean. We have stood steadfastly for liberty, but it has been a liberty regulated by law. And it has been our glory, that we have had a leading part in promoting the conception of an ordered world—that is, a world of freedom under law. President Butler has reminded us that when the Czar of all the Russias, in 1898, issued his rescript for international co-operation, it was the United States which took the lead in the movement for world organization. McKinley in his day, Theodore Roosevelt and Taft a little later, John



Hay and Elihu Root, and even the Congress of the United States at one time, pushed forward this notion of a world of order. But how it has been delayed and blocked! How slow we are to see what the whole evolution of human institutions ought to teach us!

Everybody, except perhaps a few philosophical anarchists, will admit the need of law enforcement in individual relations. To be sure, in the ideal society which is our goal, there will need to be few or no laws, or, rather, the laws will be merely guides for willingly obedient citizens and thus will be self-enforcing. But in the present world some further measures are still necessary. Take the nearest illustration—traffic regulations in a large city. Most drivers of cars are decent, law-abiding persons and are ready, even at some passing delay or inconvenience, to be controlled by the lights. But there are reckless and impatient drivers, there are drunken drivers, and so the policeman and the trial court are still needed. The offender must be dealt with by society, through physical restraint and suffering, by imprisonment, or economic pressure, by fines, or even political punishment (for some offenses) by loss of citizenship.

What is true of the individual citizen is true of the nation. If the individual as a member of the national group has obligations which cannot be escaped, so the nation, as a unit in the family of nations, has duties to each of the others and to the whole. Nations are rightly punishable for offenses against humanity. If it be objected that this involves the innocent with the guilty, it must be said that this is involved in the very nature of things. "No man liveth to himself." The black sheep disgraces the family. The imprisonment of the father means deprivation for the child. An American in the Far East who misbehaves lowers the reputation not merely of himself but of his country. "We are members one of another," in the family, in the nation, in the wider circle which includes all mankind. We are bound in the bundle of life together. We are our "brothers' keepers."

If it be said that, while we have organized governments of one sort or another to keep the individual in order or punish him for trespass, we have no law-enforcement agency in the field of international relations, it must be confessed that this is too near the truth. We have a loose body of "international law" which all civilized nations are supposed to observe, but when it is broken who is there to do anything about it? We

have still a Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, and (on paper) a Permanent Court of International Justice at Geneva, but few appeals are made and those not of large significance. We have yet (on paper) a League of Nations, but it has proved impotent in the face of outrageous infractions of pacts and treaties, since it has no effective means of enforcing its decisions. Can we then do nothing more than admit our helplessness and allow injustice to have its way?

The problem has been met and handled in smaller affairs and in a crude state of society as a temporary measure. In the early days of the gold rush in California, for example, when there were numerous wild and lawless men at large but there were no courts, no judges, no policemen, a rude piece of machinery was created in the Vigilantes—an extra-legal body, self-chosen, to exercise the restraints of decency and to visit summary punishment upon disturbers of the community life. That is about all we have been able so far to do to secure international order. Armies are enlisted and wars are waged by international "Vigilantes."

Of course all can recognize instantly the unfairness and the peril of having any one interested body assume the rôle of prosecutor and judge and executioner, all in one. No nation can be trusted to be an impartial judge of its own cause. No matter how firm the persuasion of right, there is always another side to be heard. "Vigilante" justice has no guarantee of fairness. Its conclusions at best are but a rough approximation to the right. But in the clash of national interests and ambitions, this is as far as we have been able to go up to date.

While we are still in this "Vigilante" stage, the suggestion is obvious that the best elements on the planet—meaning by that, those who believe most strongly in the reign of law and reason rather than the rule of force, those who most closely approach the ideals of freedom and justice—should stand together to defend the weak and to restrain offenders against independence and peace. For any nation to stand aside—especially for the United States, the richest and most powerful of all the nations, to stand aside—on the theory that what happens to others is no concern of ours, that it is only when our own "vital interests" are threatened that we need to act, is in plain contradiction of the Christian gospel of brotherhood. *What* we should do, is matter of dispute between honest and intelligent men; but that we should do nothing—that we should wash

our hands of all responsibility and dwell in smug safety and neutrality—that certainly is unbearable.

Mankind is a unity. If history means anything, the development of ever larger and larger social units—the family, the tribe, the nation—has been for the benefit of all. The security and the enlarged opportunity that have come as the result of combination, have more than compensated for the surrender of a little fraction of local sovereignty. As a matter of fact, with the improvement in transportation and communication and the consequent shrinking of the world into one neighborhood, the choice seems to lie between the domination of all by some single mighty Power or the free association of the nations in some form of world political community.

The doctrine of the absolute sovereignty of each State belongs to an outworn past. The sovereignty of every nation must be limited not only by the authority of God, not only by the rights of its own citizens, but also by the rights and the needs of other nations. Whatever the exact form and the details, some World State is imperative, some authority to promote the general welfare of all mankind and to repress wrongdoers. Isolation is both impossible and immoral. Lowell sang:

Is true Freedom but to break  
Fetters for our own dear sake,  
And, with leathern hearts, forget  
That we owe mankind a debt?  
No! true Freedom is to share  
All the chains our brothers wear,  
And, with heart and hand, to be  
Earnest to make others free!

Third, *Justice*. Any orderly system of government must justify itself by its results, and the results, if they are to help in the ascent of man, must include justice—fair opportunity for every man and every race.

The causes of war are far from being all economic, yet the lining up of the "haves" against the "have nots" is not without significance. A condition of content and peace can never be reached with one half the human race still below the subsistence level. Every nation feels the urgency of the need for food, for raw materials for its growing industries, and for an adequate market for the products both of its farms and

of its factories. Now, fertility is by no means identical in all countries, and the wealth of mines and wells and fields and forests is most unevenly distributed in different lands. Perhaps this is a provision of the All-Wise Father, not to show favoritism to any people but to give occasion for brotherly acts of sharing! Be that as it may, peace cannot finally triumph until economic justice as between nations is attained, and provision is made by common consent for access by all to necessary food supplies and raw materials and markets. This touches standards of living and tariffs and quotas and reciprocal trade agreements and colonies and currencies and immigration laws free from racial discrimination. "Righteousness and peace" must "kiss each other." The prophet assures us that "the work of righteousness shall be peace, and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance for ever." Secretary Hull and his close associate, Mr. Sumner Welles, have both declared recently that in the better day for which we are all seeking there must be not only reduction of national armaments but some form of international organization which will provide equal economic opportunity and open access to natural resources and raw materials for all.

But to reach a condition of stable equilibrium, there must be the justice of fair opportunity for the individual as well as for the nation. Some hold that this is impossible under the capitalistic system and that, whether gradually or at a stroke, this must be replaced by some more socialistic scheme. Others, with perhaps more reason, lay less stress on the system and more on the failings of human nature under any system, and insist that justice and peace will finally emerge not from any new political or economic device, but from an improved humanity. This necessity points to the fourth requirement.

Fourth, *Good Will*. The only final salvation for us is not by law but by love. Laws, however just and benevolent, may be ignored or evaded. Treaties, pacts, pledges, are too often thrown into the discard in crises. Sir Eric Drummond, former Secretary-General of the League of Nations, struck the truth when he declared to Dr. John R. Mott, "We have created a piece of machinery; it remains for you men of religion to fill it with content and power." Only as the recognition of the real brotherhood of man, the spirit of neighborly good will and helpfulness, prevails, will the races of men be willing for the sacrifices and the labors which the peace of the world entails. We must somehow bring the mass

to the international mind. Real "peace on earth" is possible, as the angels sang, only "among men of good will."

A nation can be unified for a little time by the spirit of conquest or by fear. But the only permanent incentive to a unified nation or a unified world is in the realm of the spiritual, is an ideal, is the spirit of good will which is at the heart of our holy faith. Freedom without good will turns into license. Order without good will may become tyranny. Even justice without good will may be hard and cold and cruel.

While the duty of this hour is to shun hatred, to administer relief, to proclaim God as the supreme object of loyalty, and to make plain that isolation holds no answer to the world's problem, the long-range program is to help build a world community, free from racial discrimination, based on justice, governed by law, and animated by good will. "Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called the children of God."

The peculiar function of the Church, then, in its relation to international problems is not to stand for any particular method—for pacifism or nonpacifism—but steadily to advocate those fundamental necessities of the human race, freedom and order and justice; and above all to produce that spirit of good will among men without which these cannot be firmly established and permanently maintained. The economist and the statesman may wrestle with the question as to *how* freedom and order and justice can be secured, but the Church alone can supply the motive power. Others may be satisfied to say, "Not charity, but justice"; the Church must cry, "Not mere justice, but love." Others may say, "Not war, but law"; the Church proclaims, "Not law, but love." Christ and His gospel of love hold the final answer to the problem of peace.

# The Meetinghouse

D. ELTON TRUEBLOOD

**I**N THE early life of America the word meetinghouse was in current use. Today it is quaint. In this fact lies evidence of a cultural revolution which is Copernican in that it involves the abandonment of a simple order with a recognized center. Whether there is a new order with a new center remains to be seen.

## I

The meetinghouse in early America, and especially in New England, was the central building of the village. It faced the village green, and, though it served chiefly as a place for the public worship of God, it had other important uses as well. Often it was the natural place for political assemblies, and, until separate schools were built, it was the center of local education. That such broad uses of houses of worship was known in the South as well as in New England is brought to our attention when we are reminded of the Bruton Parish Church of Williamsburg, so important in the early history of Virginia.

To great numbers of our ancestors the place of worship was literally the *meeting* house, because it was the center of their communal existence. They had a unitary pattern and the symbol of that unity was reverence. Under this canopy all good things could be given their rightful place.

It is important to remember that the meetinghouse, although it was used for many purposes, was first of all a place of worship. It was not that men worshiped in an auditorium, but rather that political meetings were held in a house of worship. This made a tremendous difference. The idea was not to bring religion down to the level of secular discussion, but to dignify secular discussion by placing it in a setting of dignity and reverence.

This early American cultural pattern, with its obvious unity derived from a religious center, was a revival of the major tradition of European social life. The Judeo-Christian idea, which had been formative in Western civilization since the time of Saint Augustine, was the idea of a totalitarian faith, in the sense that the supreme and inclusive



loyalty is the loyalty to God. The good life follows if all lesser loyalties find their proper places in this inclusive system. The Jews had this idea and gave it vivid expression in the statement to the effect that he Lord's House must be built on a mountain (Micah 4: 1). The Temple was the center of Jerusalem, the focus of all aspects of existence.

The medieval European city carried this Judeo-Christian ideal to its logical conclusion, organizing everything about the cathedral or chief church. The stranger had no need to ask where the center was; he could see by looking up at the stone tower. How inclusive this community center was has been vividly portrayed by Lewis Mumford, in his *The Culture of Cities*:

"The market place grows up by the church because it is there that the citizens most frequently assemble. It was in the church, in the early days, that the city's treasury was stored; and it was in the church, sometimes behind the High Altar, that deeds were deposited for safekeeping; partly because of its central location, in quarter or city, the arms might even be kept in the church. In fact, one must think of the early church as what one would now call a community center building: not too holy to serve as a dining hall for great public festivals."

At the time of American colonization this unifying conception of community life had already been partially lost in Europe, but the conditions of existence in early America facilitated the temporary reinstatement of the pattern. This reinstatement occurred, not only in New England, but, in varying degrees, in all the colonies. It is common knowledge that many of the settlers came to these shores largely because of a profound faith for which they sought adequate expression. Furthermore, life was more simple in the New World; there were fewer competing interests, and there were fewer mixtures of kinds of people in individual localities. Many of the early communities were founded by the natural cohesion of those who were likeminded and were, sometimes, separated from others by miles of wilderness or prairie. Thus the abundance of free land aided the cultural dominance of the meetinghouse. There were colonies within colonies, each with its own meetinghouse. Sects did not seem sectarian in pioneer days inasmuch as different sects tended to be in different localities. Consciously developed communities on a religious basis, such as those of the Mormons, and many others, have played a great part in the development of America and contributed to its unique character.

# The Meetinghouse

D. ELTON TRUEBLOOD

**I**N THE early life of America the word meetinghouse was in current use. Today it is quaint. In this fact lies evidence of a cultural revolution which is Copernican in that it involves the abandonment of a simple order with a recognized center. Whether there is a new order with a new center remains to be seen.

## I

The meetinghouse in early America, and especially in New England, was the central building of the village. It faced the village green, and, though it served chiefly as a place for the public worship of God, it had other important uses as well. Often it was the natural place for political assemblies, and, until separate schools were built, it was the center of local education. That such broad uses of houses of worship was known in the South as well as in New England is brought to our attention when we are reminded of the Bruton Parish Church of Williamsburg, so important in the early history of Virginia.

To great numbers of our ancestors the place of worship was literally the *meeting* house, because it was the center of their communal existence. They had a unitary pattern and the symbol of that unity was reverence. Under this canopy all good things could be given their rightful place.

It is important to remember that the meetinghouse, although it was used for many purposes, was first of all a place of worship. It was not that men worshiped in an auditorium, but rather that political meetings were held in a house of worship. This made a tremendous difference. The idea was not to bring religion down to the level of secular discussion, but to dignify secular discussion by placing it in a setting of dignity and reverence.

This early American cultural pattern, with its obvious unity derived from a religious center, was a revival of the major tradition of European social life. The Judeo-Christian idea, which had been formative in Western civilization since the time of Saint Augustine, was the idea of a totalitarian faith, in the sense that the supreme and inclusive

loyalty is the loyalty to God. The good life follows if all lesser loyalties find their proper places in this inclusive system. The Jews had this idea and gave it vivid expression in the statement to the effect that the Lord's House must be built on a mountain (Micah 4: 1). The Temple was the center of Jerusalem, the focus of all aspects of existence.

The medieval European city carried this Judeo-Christian ideal to its logical conclusion, organizing everything about the cathedral or chief church. The stranger had no need to ask where the center was; he could see by looking up at the stone tower. How inclusive this community center has been vividly portrayed by Lewis Mumford, in his *The Culture of Cities*:

"The market place grows up by the church because it is there that the citizens most frequently assemble. It was in the church, in the early days, that the city's treasury was stored; and it was in the church, sometimes behind the High Altar, that deeds were deposited for safekeeping; partly because of its central location, in quarter or city, the arms might even be kept in the church. In fact, one must think of the early church as what one would now call a community center building: not too holy to serve as a dining hall for great public festivals."

At the time of American colonization this unifying conception of community life had already been partially lost in Europe, but the conditions of existence in early America facilitated the temporary reinstatement of the pattern. This reinstatement occurred, not only in New England, but, in varying degrees, in all the colonies. It is common knowledge that many of the settlers came to these shores largely because of a profound faith for which they sought adequate expression. Furthermore, life was more simple in the New World; there were fewer competing interests, and there were fewer mixtures of kinds of people in individual localities. Many of the early communities were founded by the natural cohesion of those who were likeminded and were, sometimes, separated from others by miles of wilderness or prairie. Thus the abundance of free land aided the cultural dominance of the meetinghouse. There were colonies within colonies, each with its own meetinghouse. Sects did not seem sectarian in pioneer days inasmuch as different sects tended to be in different localities. Consciously developed communities on a religious basis, such as those of the Mormons, and many others, have played a great part in the development of America and contributed to its unique character.

It is important to remember that the production of a unitary culture about the meetinghouse did not end at the Atlantic Seaboard. This fact can be verified by my own family history as by that of so many other Americans. My grandparents on both sides settled in Iowa soon after the Civil War. The community they helped to form at that time was made up almost wholly of Quakers who bought most of the land in an area of about twenty-five square miles. There was already a rude house on my grandfather's farm when the family arrived in the spring of 1869. Immediately a Friends meeting was organized in this house. That summer the new colonists built a meetinghouse at the center of their little settlement. Since my father's baby brother died that first summer, a burial place was needed, and this was located quite naturally in the plot of ground next to the meetinghouse.

This settlement, one of thousands like it, was *really* a community. The men helped each other with their harvests, the women helped each other with their babies, the children all went to the same school, and all life was dignified because of a plain meetinghouse where the people gathered and frequently sat in complete silence each "First Day" and "Fifth Day" morning. No doubt there were many unhappy events, but the picture is attractive. I wish my generation could do as well.

## II

Apart from a few fortunate exceptions, one of which is Salt Lake City, the unitary pattern which dignified early American life is gone. There are, of course, vestiges of the pattern, one of which is the practice of holding the Brown University Commencement exercises in the ancient meetinghouse on Market Street in Providence.

But the sober truth is that the age of the meetinghouse is over. Quakers, it is true, still use the term, but they use it largely as one item in the "plain language." They refuse, for the most part, to speak of their places of worship as churches, because they wish to avoid the suggestion that one place is more holy than another. But the ordinary Friends meetinghouse is not really a cultural focus in the twentieth-century community. Like the average church it is, in the public estimation, merely a building where a few people go on Sunday. Whatever the architectural arrangement, the church has been taken out of the center. Even in England, with all the advantages of establishment, the architectural eminence of the parish church is misleading. Two years ago,

in attending a splendid service in a superb fourteenth-century village church, my son and I doubled the congregation when we entered.

How complete the cultural revolution is, becomes clear if one tries to find the location of a church in a modern city. Even the taxi drivers are at a loss if asked to go to some particular church. The service-station attendants, usually so helpful and efficient, are often no help at all in directing their customers to places of worship, but they know where the night clubs are. The point is that the churches have come to be of interest only to fragments of the community. This is partly because there are so many of them. As soon as the great separation occurred, and there were *two* meetinghouses facing the village common, the basic notion of the New England Way was already denied. It is a long step from one to two; it is a short step from two to twenty.

How much the churches have lost in cultural importance is demonstrated by the "Church Page" in the average daily newspaper. All the church news is put on one page, well on the inside, because it is *not* of general interest. Religion in the eyes of the newspaper publishers (and they know their business), is a *department*. Some people are interested in racing, some in cross-word puzzles, and some in religion. We take this meekly, but it would have been blasphemy to many of our ancestors.

When we read the church page we become more and more depressed. The sermon titles are announced in startling ways, but the vulgarity seems to be largely ineffective. The reader's chief impression is that there are a great many queer people in the world, belonging to more queer movements than he had ever supposed could exist. The chief point about most of the announcements is that they are addressed to members, just as are the notices of lodge meetings. Modern religion has ceased to be of general interest. The Lord's House is no longer on a mountain; it is on a side street.

### III

The decline of the prestige and centrality of the Church might be accepted with equanimity if some other agency had arisen to take its place, but no such agency has arisen. Many cities have what are called community centers, but no serious observer can suppose that these suffice either in theory or practice. The experiences which the community center fosters are not profound enough to be dominant. They are still peripheral. The community center is a body without a soul.

What is at stake is the order, balance and significant purpose of

our contemporary culture. The truth is, not that we have substituted one pattern for another, but that, with the decline of the meetinghouse concept, we have no distinguishable pattern at all. The place where the meetinghouse was is now a cultural vacuum. We are atomized, sectionalized, departmentalized. Our circus has a multitude of side shows, but no big top.

A striking evidence of our confusion is the predicament of modern education. In many of our states there is a legal prohibition of religious instruction in the tax-supported schools because of the supposed danger of sectarian influence. The result is that our young people are denied access to the roots of our culture. The very literature which, historically, has been the greatest single source of inspiration in Western civilization is thereby made a closed book. The child is taught to date his letters "in the year of our Lord," but his teachers are not permitted to teach about that same Lord from whose birth he dates. The child may learn about Nero, but not about Saint Paul. Even if the child goes to a Sunday School, what he learns there seems unimportant. As Phillips Osgood pointed out vividly in the February *Atlantic Monthly*, the child's Bible "is not strapped between a geography and an arithmetic."

Educationally we are in the absurd position of people who try to have the fruits of culture without nourishing the roots. Our founding fathers, many of whom were directly and consciously inspired by Christian principles, would be gravely disappointed if they could know the way in which separation between Church and State has worked out. Certainly they had no desire to deny the child the most precious part of his heritage.

Higher education presents a similar confusion and a similar impoverishment. In the older American college there was an obvious unifying factor—the college chapel. But many modern universities, especially those responsible to state and municipal governments, have no chapels at all and some which do have chapels, look upon these as quaint reminders of an earlier day. Since nothing takes the place of the chapel, the university becomes, except at athletic events, a collection of departments and schools, often jealous of one another. There has been no substitute for the chapel as the center of learning, because no other activity of the human spirit is large enough to be both inclusive and commanding. Only the highest category can unite all lesser ones.



A second example of the cultural confusion arising from the decline of the meetinghouse is our current method of dealing with human death. To a very great extent the church has allowed its ancient function in this matter to be taken over by commercial interests, and the change is not a fortunate one for the general public. Though some undertakers are gentlemen of sympathy and taste, many others take advantage of deep sorrow for personal financial gain. The growth of funeral "chapels" next to embalming rooms provides vivid testimony to the truth that the modern man, though he has lost confidence in the Church, cannot be satisfied without the things for which the Church stands. He adopts a pale substitute. The average funeral parlor tries to have the atmosphere of a church, but it cannot live down its origin. It lacks the appropriate background of belief, of shared experience, of powerful tradition.

Very early in our tradition it was recognized that the only humane treatment of death was that which gave it a place in a religious setting. To this day there are people who never enter a place of public worship on ordinary occasions, but they are quite sure that a funeral, apart from religious auspices, is an offense against sensitive spirits. If there is ever a time when we need to avail ourselves of the strength which comes from the worship of God, the time when we lose what is most precious is such a time.

Accordingly, our ancestors were wise enough to know that death is best dignified and borne by use of the ancient words from the Psalms and the New Testament. These words do not overcome sorrow, but they lift it up and put man's little day in its right place. But our ancestors did not stop here. They saw, likewise, that the proper place of burial was about the meetinghouse. Where else should it be? How wonderful to walk to the place of worship among reminders of those, already departed, whom we have known, loved and admired! "God's acre" helps to produce reality in worship, and the presence of a suitable place of worship, hallowed by generations of faith, dignifies the sorrow. The cemetery helps the Church as much as the Church helps the cemetery. The Church without a burial ground loses much of the meaning of the communion of saints; the burial ground without a church is just a field with stones in it.

Perhaps there is no more striking evidence of the poverty of our modern culture, divorced from high religion, than the entire procedure

connected with commercial cemeteries. The commercial cemetery is more painful than the funeral parlor, because we experience it longer. Some businessmen form a company, buy a farm, establish "perpetual care" and proceed to sell the land at excellent profit. The result is something which may have good shrubbery and firm turf, but it has nothing else of any importance. It is isolated, dangling, meaningless. Contrast it with Stoke Poges. Is any modern Gray likely to write an elegy inspired by Bayview Lawn? Apparently the custodian of Stoke Poges never heard of perpetual care, but what difference does that make?

#### IV

It is neither possible nor desirable to reinstate the old cultural pattern. We cannot go back to the village with its meetinghouse facing the green and we cannot go back to the college chapel. These scenes belong to greeting cards, and to pious pilgrimages. They are not really part of the modern scene. Whatever we do must be done by going forward, by starting from where we are now. The result is that we must construct, if we want a good society, a modern counterpart of the older focal point. We seek a moral equivalent of the meetinghouse.

There are some modern thinkers, notably Lewis Mumford, and some concerned with educational theory, who believe that a nucleus for community life, whether of a village or a section of a city, can be provided by the *school*. They visualize something quite different from the school of today, the most striking difference being the inclusion of adults in the educational program. But there are excellent reasons for supposing that this dream is inadequate. It would involve the frank acceptance of a naturalistic world view and would mean the elimination of worship from common life. There is no evidence that civilization can flourish on this basis and much contemporary evidence that it cannot.

To make the school the community nucleus would mean a deliberate acceptance of a lower category than the highest we know as the basis of unity. Historically the strongest bond of unity between men has been the recognition that they were children of a common father. The higher category of theism can include all the values of humanism, but the category of humanism does not include the values of theism. Of course, if belief in God were absurd or unintelligent, we might be forced to do

the best we could with a humanistic focus of experience, but, fortunately, there is no demonstration that such is the case.

It still looks as though a purified religion is the one thing that can provide a focus for the spiritual life of man. Sometimes it takes tragedy to open men's minds to the truth. There is evidence that Saint Paul's Cathedral is now once more the real symbol of the deepest things in the lives of endangered millions in the city of London.

The difficulty is that the average contemporary church is as little fitted to perform the function so desperately needed as is the average school. While the school lacks worship, the church lacks practical importance. Our basic mistake is that the church has ceased to be a meetinghouse. Fortunately, however, there are some churches which are beginning to serve as focal points of the spiritual life. One of the best examples of this tendency is seen in the Riverside Church in New York. Part of its inclusiveness is illustrated by the fact that it includes a special tower room for a Quaker meeting, which is held each Sunday. This church demonstrates the paradox that a church, by becoming more frankly local, thereby becomes more truly catholic. If Doctor Fosdick presided over the fourteenth Baptist Church, he would seem to be the servant of a special section of the community, but insofar as his church really is the Riverside Church, with no other adjectives, he emphasizes his responsibility to all sorts and conditions of men in that area. The catholicity of a church is inversely proportional to the number of adjectives.

The spiritual life of the community should include art and music and science, but these find their proper place when they are seen in the light of their religious implications. Religion is that enterprise which brings to completion the various forms of the spiritual life of man. Science reaches its true dignity when it becomes an effort to think God's thoughts after Him, art reaches its true dignity when the beholder catches some glimpse of the mind and meaning of the Artist, moral law achieves genuine significance when it is ascribed to a Lawgiver. Why should not the art museum, the symphony hall and the public library all be side chapels of the central place of worship? These things belong together and lose much in isolation. What is wanted is something which pulls together and thereby strengthens all the fugitive expressions of the life of the spirit.

Perhaps the most important fact for us to face in the whole problem under discussion is the fact that there is a vast amount of spiritual life quite outside the churches. The churches have no monopoly on the life of the spirit and never have had. It appears in all sorts of ways, some of them pathetic. It appears in hosts of service clubs which sometimes have more sermons in a year than most churches have. Much of our devotion to music is qualitatively religious. But we cannot rest satisfied with this situation. The spiritual life of our time is feeble and barren because it exists in isolation and without adequate nourishment. An inarticulate faith may be better than no faith at all, but it might be far more effective than it is, in the reconstruction of our civilization, if it had more encouragement in articulation.

What is needed is some form of expression in which the spiritual life which actually does exist, both inside and outside the churches, may be saved, used and developed. We need a setting which will help us as men to express our gratitude for undeserved joys, to meet our sorrows with courage, to remember the long past which we inherit, and to purify our desires for the future. We have no blueprint of the way in which this can be accomplished, but we are beginning to see that, unless it is accomplished, the ultimate symbol of our alleged civilization will be a Tower of Babel where the spire of the meetinghouse once stood.

## Canadian Churches and Postwar Reconstruction

CLARIS EDWIN SILCOX

**I**N TIME of war, we should prepare for peace, but it is not easy to do this during a *Blitzkrieg* when everybody is in the front line and there is little time to plan for anything but the next steps in resistance. There is an old English recipe for jugged hare which begins: "first, catch the hare." So it must be obvious that the first requirement for postwar reconstruction is to defeat the enemy. This is particularly important when one considers the character and the objectives of the enemy we are fighting. If he wins, we shall have nothing to say about the nature of the postwar world. The peace will then be "made in Germany," and the people of other nations will be subordinated to the needs and purposes of the German leaders. Unless the Nazi spirit is eliminated or reduced to impotence, it is futile to dream of a better and kindlier world. Even if the war were concluded by a negotiated peace, we should have to keep armed to the teeth against some new outbreak, and under such circumstances, no people could plan for a better day. This is a war to the death!

Such stern realities in the situation have justified the hesitation of the British Commonwealth of Nations in announcing its war aims. Its immediate war aim is to stop Hitler and to place the international bandits where they can do no more harm. It would be futile and even dangerous to make rash promises to this or that nation, whether enslaved now or still free, which it would be difficult, if not impossible, to implement with the return of peace. For peace may bring with it an entirely new set of factors which could not possibly be incorporated in any set of blueprints which we might idealistically draw up at the present time. At the close of the war, we shall have to make an inventory of the psychological attitudes of individuals and nations which may have survived, the lessons learned in the course of the conflict, the treatment to which the enslaved peoples have been subjected, the complete dislocation of the normal course of world markets, the immediate economic problems which will face the victors as well as the vanquished during the period

of partial demobilization, the countless minorities that require protection and whom it may be increasingly difficult to protect, the complications involved in redrawing boundary lines, the various proposals for the establishment of world order and an international police. How can we set forth now the outlines of the new world, when all this is beyond the ken of the wisest men? So much depends upon circumstances, and alas, on human nature.

Before the collapse of France, many Canadian church leaders were thinking in terms of the postwar world; but when the Maginot line was by-passed, and the epic of Dunkirk belonged "to the ages," most of these dreams had to be put to one side while they marshalled their spiritual resources to maintain morale and their material resources to guarantee survival. They are still thinking, when time permits, of the kind of world they would like to bring to pass, of a new order which would be truly Christian and truly practicable, but so far no blueprints have been published except some manifestos put forward in respect to world order by branches of the League of Nations Society of Canada.

In the Roman Catholic Church—and Canada is more than forty per cent Roman Catholic—attention is being given to recent papal pronouncements and a branch is being formed of the *Sword of the Spirit*, a movement founded by Cardinal Hinsley in the United Kingdom, the purposes of which include:

1. To combat those forces in the totalitarian system which undermine human society and Christian civilization, and to spread the knowledge of the principles which are the foundation of social order and our Christian inheritance.
2. To fight for our cause until victory.
3. After victory, to strive for the reconstruction of Europe on these same natural and Christian principles.
4. To unite the citizens of this country in support of the principles at stake in this war and in the future peace.

To judge from the literature of the movement issued already in England, the main concerns relate to the human person, to freedom, to the family and to communities and associations. In general, the emphasis of the movement is on the rights of personality and the family as against the absolute value of the state, and in its support of the family, much emphasis is being laid on family allowances as one method of obviating the tendency of our present economic system toward race suicide.

In the non-Roman Catholic churches, great attention has been paid



to the findings of the Malvern conference, and informal, if unofficial, committees are already at work seeking to revise the Malvern findings with particular reference to their relevance to the Canadian scene. To date, however, no official statement has come from any of the churches and consequently no one can say what the Canadian churches really do envisage as a Christian social order after the war. They have supported to the full the introduction of unemployment insurance which, because of constitutional difficulties, was delayed until after the outbreak of the war, and they show many signs of believing that great changes are imperative in the financial and monetary field, but it is improbable that any of them will issue any new and extensive statement on the subject of reconstruction except for purposes of study and discussion. The Canadian economy, it must be remembered, is peculiarly influenced by world conditions. Although our population is but twelve million, we are about the fifth largest trading nation in the world. We live by balancing huge exports against huge imports, and we cannot well solve our own internal problems unless we have some assurance of the relative stability of world markets. We are thus always forced to make terms with reality.

At a recent meeting of a presbytery called especially to consider the problems of reconstruction, a question was raised which proved almost impossible to answer. This was: when we have won the war, what shall we do with Germany? It is all very well to say that we must show a Christian attitude toward Germany, but it is more difficult to say what is involved in a Christian attitude toward Germany. Some feel that Germany must be punished, and if the punishment is corrective and preventive, and not merely vindictive, there is much to be said for it on Christian grounds. But if the punishment inflicted is going to hurt the victors more than it hurts the vanquished, there will be little profit, material or moral, for anybody. There is also something to be said for the "atomization" of Germany, if Germany can be prevented thereby from doing again in another twenty years what, as Sir Robert Vansittart points out, she has already done five times in the last one hundred years. In her studied efforts at world conquest, she picked a quarrel with Denmark in 1864, with Austria in 1866, with France in 1870, with the better part of the world in 1914, and she deliberately sought world conquest in a most horrible way in 1939. This is a "black record," and however certain pacifist groups may explain it away, the Czechs, Austrians, Poles, Danes, Norwegians, Belgians, Dutch, Jugoslavs, Greeks and French,

to say nothing of the Russians and the British, have had enough of it, and just as the G-men acted on the supposition that men must be taught that crime does not pay, it would seem obvious that Germany must be taught that war does not pay. Sometimes it seems as if it may be necessary to crack their skulls open to get that truth through. At all events, the sentimentalist has done enough harm in the world as it is, and he had better keep quiet until Germany is taught the necessary lesson.

But how are we going to teach her? May it not involve military occupation and the preservation of order until she learns better? After the last war there were constant efforts in Germany to sabotage the efforts of the new government, sometimes on the part of the communists, at other times on the part of the Junkers, while the German church played a rather inglorious rôle in the period of reconstruction. Is there any hope that the government of Germany can be turned over to those elements in the country which have been cowed into silence during the long eight years of the Nazi regime and refused any practical experience in political administration? Would we help Russia to set up a communist regime in Germany? Such a regime would probably be infinitely better than the continuance of the rule of the Nazis, but is communism the road to true self-government? Has the Confessional church given the slightest intimation that it would be capable of accepting responsibility for the creation of a Christian civilization when many of its leaders have been addicted to a theology which is other-worldly and even defeatist? Can we trust the converted ex-Nazis who fled from Germany as refugees to return and form a new government? Is there no moral sulfanilamide which we can give to the German people which will quickly destroy the germs of mania, illusion and lust for conquest that have made her the destroyer of four hundred million happinesses in Europe, to quote Sir Robert Vansittart, and led her to seek to destroy the unity and sanity of almost every country in the world outside of Europe? And what can be done with the Nazi youth and the Nazi women whose minds and spirits have been systematically distorted by the gang of paper hangers, drug peddlars, professional liars and other "bloodthirsty gutter-snipes" who have gained the mastery of that country during the last eight years? Some say: "Re-education," but does anyone believe that re-education is apt to succeed in our generation or in the next? Others

say: wipe them out even as they are deliberately seeking to wipe out the Poles; do unto them as they would do to others. Perhaps, the war itself may provide an answer to this problem; perhaps, before the war is over, a good many of the cities of Germany will be wiped out, and with them the innocent along with the guilty. It may also be that many of the Nazi leaders will take themselves off to meet the judgment of Almighty God in the world to come. They may either have committed suicide or have been assassinated by their own people or the peoples whom they have enslaved. Such an eventuality might help to solve what would otherwise prove an almost insoluble problem. But the final solution of this problem is primarily dependent upon the condition of the German mind when the war is over. The problem therefore is less economic and political than psychological; a task for psychiatrists not diplomats.

Then, what about world order? A good many minds are working on that problem. Some envisage a world largely dominated by Great Britain and the United States, and this may be necessary for a time, but let it not be forgotten that other countries must be consulted if a lasting peace is to ensue. Russia cannot possibly be ignored in the terms of peace. Perhaps, in the last analysis, the Russian resistance will prove the single biggest factor in taming Germany even if it is ultimately unsuccessful. Then there will be the other refugee governments to consider, and the European neutrals such as they are even though they may have played a rather inglorious and unheroic rôle in this war.

Nor can we in the terms of peace envisage merely a United States of Europe. The new order must be a world order, not merely a European order. It must be an order in which China can find security, in which the resourcefulness of the Dutch in building up their great empire in the Malay straits will be rewarded, in which the complex question of Indian self-government may be steadily resolved, in which the western hemisphere will learn its true relation to the rest of the world, in which African peoples may find new protection against exploitation while they are not forced to bear political and economic burdens for which they are not yet trained, in which the future of Australia may be adequately safeguarded against the constant menace from land-hungry nations that wish to burst their limits at the expense of those whose fathers pioneered in the wilderness and laid the bases of civilization in remote corners of the

globe. The first lesson which Europe must learn is that the world is not its oyster, even if the history of the world since 1492 has largely been the history of the expansion of Europe.

In the current discussions on world order, the words "federalism" and "abrogation of national sovereignty" are frequently used. Sovereignty is fundamental to law and order, and in any political system it must be resident somewhere. In any federation, aspects of sovereignty are resident in the federation itself while other aspects of sovereignty may be resident in the component parts, but this allocation of prerogatives may prove but the prelude to long struggles and disputes such as characterized the controversies over state rights in the United States, and the never-ending conflict between the dominion and the provinces in Canada. When individual states in the United States were so hesitant to yield one iota of their sovereign rights, and when individual provinces in Canada, by insisting on their prerogatives, held up all possibility of solving economic problems during the depression, is there any great likelihood that we shall secure from the various nations of the world, so different in their form of government, cultural level, the nature of their economic problems, the ratio of their populations to their inherent resources, their self-stability and self-containment, any great surrender of those rights? After the last war, there was a revival of nationalism which was contemporaneous with the rise of the League of Nations, while some nations refused to belong to the League unless all the teeth in it had first been drawn. In Europe, a number of submerged nations secured a new lease of life—Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia. Is the progress of nationality in the world toward greater differentiation or toward greater homogeneity? Is it the will of nature that mankind continue to be so differentiated or to be fused together in one universal melting pot? If progress is toward differentiation, then it is going to be more difficult to determine the points at which national sovereignty must be surrendered, and those at which it should be retained. Mommsen, in the first chapter of his monumental *History of Rome*, makes clear the distinction between the insistence of the Greek on self-expression and the subordination of the Latin to the totalitarian state. Is the hope of the race in Greek self-expression or the discipline of the Roman?

It would be well for those who advocate federation so strenuously to study the comparative failure of federation in their own systems of

government. Canada has a dual experience in this matter which makes her extremely cautious. When the provinces of British North America were federated into the Dominion of Canada in 1867, it was thought that safeguards had been created against the possibility of such internal strife as plunged the United States into civil war. All powers not specified as being the prerogatives of the provincial governments were assumed to be resident in the Dominion government, and the Dominion was thus regarded not as a federation of sovereign states, but as a confederation in which certain geographical areas were given assurances of a measure of self-government. But Canada had been constituted by two racial-language groups—the French and the English—and the majority of the French were concentrated in the province of Quebec. The Imperial Parliament, in passing the British North America Act, tried to protect the rights of the French minority, and the French wished to be governed by their own civil code. Consequently, the British government placed “property and civil rights” among the prerogatives of the provinces.

Since 1867, hardly any important measure has been passed by the House of Commons at Ottawa which could not, by some stretch of the legal imagination, be interpreted as infringing on the field of property and civil rights, and if Quebec claimed certain privileges in this respect, other provinces would do the same. Consequently, act after act has been appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in Great Britain for a legal opinion, and time and again, provincial authority was sustained. The result of all this was that when the depression hit Canada in 1929, it was practically impossible within the existing constitutional framework to effect any adequate redress. The provinces bucked, claiming prerogatives but refusing to accept the responsibilities which accompany such rights, the Dominion government being left with the responsibility but without the rights. It is well to protect minorities, but if the tail insists on wagging the dog, what chance has the dog?

On the other hand, in the British Commonwealth of Nations, we have effected the most extraordinary system of unity in freedom which the world has ever seen. The members of the Commonwealth are all mistresses in their own homes. Canada, Australia, South Africa and New Zealand were not automatically at war when the United Kingdom declared war. In their own name they declared war, and in their own name they will sign the treaty of peace. They are intensely jealous of



their autonomy and independence. They control their own customs duties and shut out each other's goods when they feel so disposed. Different currencies are used, the Canadian dollar being more closely related to the American dollar than to the pound sterling. They determine their own laws regarding immigration. Canada, for instance, can make it impossible for any other Britishers to enter the Dominion, and during the depression she deported a number of Englishmen who had not proved useful citizens. Canada too had her own army, navy and air force. She was as free from the dictation of the parliament at Westminster as are the countries of Europe, except perhaps insofar as she is loyal to the same throne and as the final court of appeal in law at present is in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of the United Kingdom. But with all this freedom and with no imperial parliament at all, the Commonwealth of Nations is able to achieve a remarkable unity of action. What binds us together is a common spirit and tradition, a common pride in our own family of nations. Our imperial conferences are not legislative bodies, but family gatherings; for the most part, our legal agreements are made between the individual members as occasions arise. The machinery frequently creaks. It creaked at the Ottawa Conference in 1932. It creaked and still creaks when the Free State of Ireland refused to enter the war or to give England the air bases which, under the original terms of the separation later surrendered, she was obligated to give. But with it all, there is a remarkable unity of purpose which has held the empire together, while the League of Nations disintegrated because the individual members were not willing to fulfill the most elementary terms of the covenant unless it suited their convenience.

In short, members of the British Commonwealth of Nations have already a world federation whose "service is perfect freedom," and out of this experience of ours, we know that the process of sticking together is ultimately dependent not on formal constitutions but on the will to stick together. In the last analysis, even the United States of America is held together by the will to stick, not by the Constitution. The Civil War proved that. Walt Whitman in "Over the Carnage Rose Prophetic a Voice" said something which needs to be heard above the present booming of guns:

"Were you looking to be held together by lawyers?

Or by an agreement on a paper? or by arms?

Nay, nor the world, nor any living thing, will so cohere."



That is why some of us feel that the possibilities of world order after the war are contingent less on federations, treaties, alliances, documents with red seals and imposing signatures than on *the will to cohere*. That is why we in Canada felt that the greatest sinner after the last war was the United States which showed no signs of the will to cohere, and why we rejoiced when the other day Mr. Sumner Welles and later, Mr. Wendell Willkie indicated that some reconstitution of the League of Nations was necessary for the peace of the world after the war.

Given the will to cohere, much may happen. We should not make the mistake, however, of hesitating until we have worked out all the details of a constitution to the satisfaction of everybody. Let us proceed to create anew the society of nations, including as members all those nations, and only those nations, who give tangible evidence of their "will to cohere," and let this new commonwealth of nations be so strong and keep itself so strong that other nations will plead for admission, knowing that only within it may they find security and economic freedom. The nucleus of that new commonwealth may well be the British Empire, the United States of America, the countries at present enslaved and who must realize better now than before that only in union is there strength, and such other countries as China and Russia. Those who have fought for freedom must organize the world for freedom, while the countries who tried to dominate their fellow men should stay on the mourner's bench until they show signs of true contrition, not only in their words but in their works. This may not seem to be Christian idealism, but it is Christian realism, and the sooner idealists become realists, the better.

Since the last war, the Canadian churches have given lip service to the idea of the League of Nations. They have trusted, perhaps naïvely, the League to provide the security we desired. Indeed, many in Canada were disposed to orientate our foreign policy to the League rather than to the Empire. On the whole, the churches still believe that collective security must be obtained from some League of Nations, and doubt if, after the war, we shall be able to offer stricken humanity anything better than the very League of Nations which, in the emergency, we failed to use as we should. Some changes, both in structure and membership, may have to be made, but only a League holds real hope for the future, especially if the members have the will to cohere and to pay the price essential to the enforcement of peace. It is not improbable that we shall have an effective League of Nations before we are able to get the petty

denominations with their genius for infallibility, if not for sovereignty, to recognize the authority of the World Council of Churches.

Many questions of first importance must be left to such a society to solve as occasions arise—questions of common citizenship, common currency, freedom of trade, international banking services, common labor standards, control of international investments and the granting of charters to incorporated companies doing business in many countries, the development of an international police force, control of armaments, and these questions, immensely difficult, may be solved in time if we have the will to solve them. But they will never be solved if any important nation takes an isolationist position, whether in a national or hemispheric sense, and ignores the fact that within the four seas all men are, or should be, brothers. Enduring constitutions have been of slow growth, and even when approved can be enforced only by an already-existing loyalty. Consequently, the great task today, even in wartime, is to develop this new sense of loyalty to an international ideal, and this must largely be the work of the Christian churches, and to a smaller degree, of the schools. Our schools are the creation of the state, but the Church of God is the creation of a spirit that goes far beyond national, racial or language boundaries. It alone, if it has but the will, can provide the spiritual dynamic of a world order. And the churches in Canada must be prepared in postwar days not only to endorse the idea of a League of Nations but to fight for its right to mould the destinies of men with the spirit of crusaders. Lip service alone will not do. On the other hand, if churchmen take a purely sentimental and carping attitude, demanding that in our dynamic and ever-shifting world, all the details of world co-operation are clearly charted in advance, we shall never be able to take the first steps. Babies learn to walk only by walking.

Having formed the League, the constituent nations must, through the world organization, face certain problems of outstanding significance at the outset. The most immediate will be *the enforcement of peace*, and the enforcement of peace means force and sanctions, economic and military. There can be no world order until anarchy is repressed, bandits put where they can do no harm, freebooters brought to time and international law vindicated. This means that the victorious nations must assume the responsibility, however distasteful, for repressing outbreaks anywhere in the world. If big and little bandits begin to realize that

they must reckon with superior force that will put a straightjacket on them in less time than it takes to say "Jack Robinson" they will change their tune and learn, as bandits only can learn, the fundamental basis of morality. We need a new vision of the dignity of law. The new commonwealth of nations must be prepared, like the G-men, to drive robber nations off the face of the earth; then and then only will men learn that war and international crime do not pay.

A second step toward world security is *the development of a sound basis for access to goods and for exchange of goods in trade*. No countries are self-sufficient, and in a relatively peaceful world, there is no reason why they should be. But they need to learn elementary lessons in economics. They need to learn that trade is a two-way street, and that they cannot sell goods or services to other people indefinitely unless they are willing to take goods and services in return. Nations, too, need to learn that capital investments in foreign countries are only valid when the lending nations are willing to take goods and services in return over a period of years. One of the greatest pieces of economic illiteracy displayed by Americans after the last war was the assumption on their part that they could loan money abroad, thus creating new markets for American goods, and be repaid only in gold. This led to the impoverishment of the rest of the world, and ultimately to their inability to purchase anything—even the things they absolutely needed—from the United States to maintain their own industries and economic life. In particular, creditor nations must remember that for them free trade is almost an imperative moral obligation, while only debtor nations are justified in taking steps to limit imports to the end that they may be able to pay their debts. One cannot play the game of monopoly after one of the players has cornered all the money.

In developing such a sound basis for trade, much that is revolutionary may need to be learned. Complete freedom of trade in the world and a common currency might only make the rich richer and the poor poorer. Individuals or corporations strategically located might through combines, monopolies or mass production be able to offer goods cheaper than any other firm, and these might find the wealth of all the world flowing toward them even as the financial dominance of some Eastern cities in the United States at the present time tends to draw off too large a share of the purchasing power of the nation to individuals

and companies located in that area. Indeed, it may be that the world needs more corporations and fewer big ones striding it like some Colossus; it may be that the world needs more nations and not fewer within the general federation, in order that safeguards may be provided for those who live in areas somewhat restricted in production or by climate, but which can yet provide in a world not dominated by monopolies, an excellent place of residence and an admirable school for character. It may even be when a world federation has been created, that large countries like the United States, Canada, Russia and Germany might very properly be divided up into smaller units within the one greater whole.

The third step, growing out of the second, involves *a sounder conception of the monetary system as an adequate means of exchange*. The Archbishop of York put it very neatly when he said that a Christian economic system must reverse the unnatural order which we follow at present; our whole existing economic system is built on the will of the financiers. Only what they approve stands any chance of succeeding; only such things as seem to offer an assured profit receive their approval whether these things are what a socially sane state requires or not. In the existing order, finance is given first place; then production and finally consumption. We must reverse this unnatural sequence, the Archbishop affirms, and put consumption first, production next and finance last. The present monetary system is badly shot, but to date the suggestions made for revising the system are not overconvincing. Everyone fears inflation but nobody seems to be defining it overcarefully. During the depression we had production without purchasing power; now we have purchasing power without much to buy with it. Of course, we are buying with this purchasing power things we do not use as individuals but in common—tanks, battle planes, bombs, heavy artillery, Bren guns, but when the war is over much that we have thus purchased out of our common purse will be of little use to anyone. Much of it will be outmoded. Much else will be sunk beneath the waters of ocean or blown to pieces. The homes that have been destroyed, the cathedrals that have been demolished, may have a certain salvage value, but much of the real wealth we are creating now will be quite unusable. It can neither be worn nor eaten nor added to our living-room furniture. Thus, the government necessarily takes back from us our increased purchasing power in taxation to pay for those things which are necessary so long

as the war lasts but of no great value to us in times of peace. Meanwhile, there are more dollars and cents going around than ever. Thus, as our real wealth is diminishing, our monetary wealth is increasing. That, one has reason to believe, is inflation. But after the war, if by a similar method of taxation we create public works of common and lasting value, the increase in monetary wealth should not be inflation.

How are we to reckon our real wealth? Is it to be estimated by the amount of gold bullion piled high in our national treasuries? No one denies the importance of gold as one index to a nation's wealth, and certainly our Canadian gold mines have helped us during the depression to keep afloat. We dug the gold up from the ground, sold it to the government, and the government sold it to the United States, and the United States put it back in the ground somewhere in Kentucky. Like Brutus, we were all honorable men, but just what good did all that gold do? Even while it was accumulating, tens of millions of people in the United States faced economic insecurity and if employed at all, were employed at makeshift jobs created for them by public charity.

Canadians do not want to do away with the gold standard, for there is plenty of it in the Laurentian shield and we are glad and happy to keep on digging it up and sending it to the United States in return for something more generally useful, but sometimes these activities seem slightly queer in people who have supposedly passed the stage of adolescence. Yet, gold is one index of purchasing power which a nation possesses and that index should be kept.

It cannot, however, be the only index. There is an excellent story told in Marco Polo's *Travels* of the conquest of the city of Baldach by Ulaú. Ulaú, the Tartar, took the city by a strategem, and when he entered it and the khalif of the city was surrendered to him, he discovered a tower filled with gold. "He called the khalif before him, and after reproaching him with his avarice, that prevented him from employing his treasures in the formation of any army for the defense of his capital against the powerful invasion with which it had been threatened, gave orders for his being shut up in this same tower without sustenance; and there, in the midst of his wealth, he soon finished a miserable existence" (Book I: Chapter VIII).

Important as is gold, there must be other indices which help to determine the amount of purchasing power legitimately issued by a



government. Among these should be the value of improved property—fertile and irrigated lands capable of sustaining population, comfortable and well-appointed homes designed to house several generations of people, the enduring means of life available to a people if proper means of assessing their value can be found, the actual productivity of a people as evidenced in existing mechanisms of production and in the national income, the extent and value of public works such as roads, highways and airfields. It is difficult to estimate the value of these public works except at their replacement value, since most of them are not self-liquidating and no direct income or profit is derivable from them, but nevertheless what they mean in public happiness, in health, in the broadening of culture, in the actual saving of time and money in transportation, even as a piece of military defense, is incalculable. It seems strange that we cannot even build public works in times of depression without borrowing the money from private monopolists of credit on their terms, and then when they get beyond their depths they seek protection in the "credit of the nation." We must develop a monetary system which will encourage people to create enduring consumer goods and not stop functioning whenever those who manipulate credit fear that they will not receive the pay their services require. Perhaps, a League of Nations may be able eventually to devise a sound international currency, supported by an international banking system, and giving credit on the standards of human well-being acquired by any particular nation as well as on its reserve of gold.

There are many other problems which might be dealt with, but one in particular deserves the attention of the people of the western hemisphere. The New World which we call America is essentially a melting pot of many races and nationalities—Indians, Negroes, Spaniards, Portuguese, French, Dutch, Anglo-Saxons at the base, and these in turn supporting vast migrations from every country of Europe and from many countries in Asia. Both Canada and the United States are in themselves leagues of races. Europe's population was congested; America's resources were far in excess of the needs of her population. At first we supplied each other's deficiencies. We sent Europe raw materials and Europe sent us, in addition to certain manufactured goods, surplus population. Then after the last war we feared lest our cultural traditions could not survive such an ethnic dilution, and we slammed



the doors on our prospective immigrants. Our reasons may have been good and proper in their way, but in doing so, we invited economic distress for ourselves and for Europe. Our economy had been planned for an ever-greater population and when we changed our policy of immigration, our economic system would not work. In addition to adding to our discomfiture, we froze as it were Europe's safety valve, and prevented the escape from that continent of people who needed land, resources and new economic opportunity. We suffocated under our surpluses while they hovered on the brink of poverty and famine. We neither made it possible for them to purchase what they needed from us, nor would let them come over and share our surplus wealth with us.

It is hardly conceivable that the infinite resources of the Americas should perpetually remain the perquisite of some two hundred and fifty million people, while half a billion struggle to maintain a precarious livelihood from the depleted resources of Europe and turn to war in despair. Despite the very real great cultural difficulties involved Canadians and Americans must rethink their duty to the immigrant. The elucidation of that duty would require volumes, but there is already evidence that one church—the Church of England in Canada—is making this problem a major subject of study and research.

Perhaps the greatest contribution which America (North and South) can make to the future peace of the world will be *in the concerted effort to devise a sane system of migration which will place the resources and the population of the world in a more wholesome juxtaposition than at present*. Europe has the population; we have the resources. The real answer is obvious. As we think of these things, we may, with Whitman, hear the Americas singing, and the songs they sing may be in many tongues, but they will be the songs of those who have been redeemed from economic slavery and have found new joy and sanctuary in this continent which God has kept until "the fullness of time."

The task of reconstruction is replete with imponderables and with barbed wire, but if Canadians and Americans are willing to venture much on Christian solutions, we shall not only win the war but what is even more difficult—we shall win the peace.

# The Prayer Book of Jews and Christians

THOMAS WHITE CURRIE

THE Jews made three divisions of the writings contained in the Old Testament. They spoke of these Scriptures as the Law, the Prophets and the Holy Writings. This division commends itself to one who undertakes to appreciate and utilize these wonderful records. It is a good psychological division. The Law, the Pentateuch, is an expression of God's will for man. The Prophets, including what we call the historical books, plus the writings of the sixteen major and minor Prophets, represent an effort on the part of the writers to interpret the Law. The Holy Writings, including all the poetical books, show the outgoings of the human heart in response to the Law of God as interpreted by the Prophets. Our Saviour recognized this division. In Luke 24: 44-47 is clearly seen His acceptance of this method of grouping the sacred writings of His people. "And He said unto them these are my words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in *the Law of Moses, and the prophets and the psalms* concerning me. Then opened He their mind, that they might understand the Scriptures; and He said unto them, Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name unto all the nations beginning from Jerusalem."

Thus the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament became to the Jews, as they have later become to Christians, a clear picture of God's expressed desire for individual men and for groups of men. He plans to take us men and show us what His ideals are for us. He then shows us how we free men are prone to go contrary to His will as expressed in His Law. He shows us how we as sinning men can, by repentance and through forgiveness, start on the romance of growing into God's likeness—into the kind of people who please Him—the kind of people whom He can use in building the race into one great family of brothers and sisters with God as Father. Those people who became repentant and who experienced the thrill of forgiveness, who found themselves willing to be used by God

in building His pattern Kingdom, are the people who became the authors of the Psalms. These poems represent the outgoing of the hearts of these remade persons in response to God's love and guidance. In these poems is clearly seen pictures of human personalities on their way from sin and revolt into a fellowship with God which made them into the kind of people who in every generation have "outlived, outthought and outdied their fellow men."

These poems which we call the Psalter are a precursor of what Paul said in Romans about the method and effect of salvation. He tells us that Abraham and David were remade by the same process by which men were being remade in the Christian tradition under his preaching and that of his fellow Christians. We read in Romans 4: 1-8: "What then shall we say that Abraham, our forefather, hath found according to the flesh? For if Abraham was justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not toward God. For what saith the Scripture? 'And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness.' Now to him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned as of grace, but as of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness. Even as David also pronounceth blessing upon the man unto whom God reckoneth righteousness apart from works, saying, 'Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not reckon sin.'" In this statement of Paul is clearly revealed the reason why the poems of the Psalter are as precious to Christians as they were to the Jehovah-worshipping Jews. All, both Jehovah-worshipping Jews and Christians, belong to the class of persons who have experienced the redeeming power of God's love as it remakes people who are willing to confess sin and to trust God for forgiveness. There is a spiritual kinship here which is unmistakable which readily accounts for the continuing use by Christians of these poems written in the long ago by Jehovah-worshipping Jews.

The poems of the Psalter were written and collected over a long period of years. The American Revised Edition of our Bible reveals five divisions. These divisions doubtless came into existence as did the famous hymnbooks of Moody and Sankey known as Gospel Hymns. These hymns of Moody and Sankey were expressed in six collections. The poems of the Psalter were gathered into five groups. The poems in Book One, Psalms 1-41, are prevailingly personal. Those in Book Two, Psalms

42—72, and in Book Three, Psalms 73—89, are prevailingly national. Book Four, Psalms 90—106, and Book Five, Psalms 107—150, are prevailingly liturgical.

One hundred of the poems are assigned authors. Fifty of the poems have no author named. Following is a list of the writers and the number of poems accredited to each:

Accredited to Moses, one:	Psalms 90;
Accredited to David, seventy-three:	Psalms 3—9, 11—32, 34—41, 51—65, 68—70, 85, 101—103, 108—110, 122, 124, 131, 133, 138—145;
Accredited to Solomon, two:	Psalms 72, 128;
Accredited to Asaph, twelve:	Psalms 50, 73—83;
Accredited to Korah, ten:	Psalms 42, 43, 44—49, 84, 85, 87;
Accredited to Heman, one:	Psalms 88;
Accredited to Ethan, one:	Psalms 89.

Readers of the Psalms will profit by following some sort of classification whereby the poems are grouped according to topic treated. Following is a classification which will be found helpful.

1. Songs of Praise:
  - a—Nature: Psalms 8, 19, 29, 65, 104;
  - b—Providence: Psalms 103, 107, 113, 145;
2. Didactic—God's Moral Government of the World:
  - a—Moral: Psalms 1, 34, 37, 49, 73, 77;
  - b—Personal—Morality: Psalms 15, 24, 32, 40, 50;
  - c—Confession of Sin: Psalms 6, 32, 38, 51, 102, 130, 143;
3. National:
  - a—Prayers at times of National Disaster: Psalms 44, 60, 74, 79;
  - b—Prayers of thanksgiving for national deliverance: Psalms 46, 47, 48, 65, 66, 68, 75, 76;
4. Historical Poems: Psalms 78, 81, 105, 106, 114;
5. Poems looking forward to the Ideal King. These are called Messianic Psalms:
  - a—The Messiah as Ruler: Psalms 2, 18, 20, 21, 45, 61, 72, 89, 110, 132;
  - b—The Messiah pictured as winning His Kingdom through suffering and vicarious love: Psalms 22, 35, 41, 55, 69, 109;
  - c—The Messiah pictured as the Perfect Man—Son of Man Poems: Psalms 8, 16, 40;
  - d—The Messiah pictured as actively winning His Kingdom: Psalms 18, 68, 96, 97, 98;
6. Poems expressing personal reactions to God and the true religion: Psalms 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 22, 23, 25, 27, 30, 34, 40, 42, 43, 116, 121, 139;
7. Life Problem Poems: Psalms 37, 73;
8. Poems touching the future life: Psalms 16, 17, 49, 73;

9. Poems showing varying attitudes toward the enemies of God and of Israel:
  - a—These enemies are marked for destruction: Psalms 2, 9, 68;
  - b—These enemies are potential sharers of Israel's blessedness, and are to be won through the unselfish love of God and of God's people: Psalms 6, 18, 22, 67, 87;
  - c—These enemies merit the hatred and contempt of God's people—Prayers are made for their destruction: Psalms 7, 35, 59, 69, 79, 109, 137, 138, 139;
10. Poems dealing with sin, confession and forgiveness: Psalms 19, 25, 32, 50, 51, 65, 66, 69, 73, 130, 142;
11. Poems of Praise and Worship:
  - a—Personal appreciation of religion: Psalms 23, 27, 42, 43, 63, 84;
  - b—Hallelujah Psalms sung in connection with worship in the Temple:  
(Each begins with Hallelujah) Psalms 111, 112, 113, 146, 150;  
(Each closes with Hallelujah) Psalms 115—117, 146—150;  
The Great Hallelujah Psalm 136 (Sung at the beginning of Passover);  
The Lesser Hallelujah Psalms 113—118 (Sung at the close of Passover);
  - c—Poems sung as groups of people marched from their homes up to Jerusalem for the three great feasts of Passover, Pentecost and Tabernacles: Psalms 120—134 (Known as "Songs of Ascent").

The space allotted to this paper will not allow a detailed discussion of each Psalm, nor will it allow a discussion of each group of Psalms set out above. One who desires to profit personally from reading the Psalter will find poems in each of the above classifications wonderfully suited to his particular mood and need.

If he is troubled by sin, he should read Psalms 51 and 32, 130 and 143. Martin Luther said these poems are Pauline because of the way with which they deal with sin, confession and forgiveness. Augustine of Hippo said he often read Psalm 32 with weeping heart and eyes. No better description can be found in all literature of the processes by which sinning people are remade into creative co-operators working with the Creative God in building His Kingdom amongst the peoples of the race.

If one is interested in the method by which religion arises in the human soul, he should read Psalm 139. Here we observe the testimony of the human heart touching the inescapable God. The testimony is that God allows no soul to come into and pass through the experience of living without being constantly reminded of the presence of God's Spirit endeavoring to persuade him to open the way in his life for the redemptive processes which God desires him to use. If he is willing to use these processes, he is then on his way to Godlikeness in character and behavior.

If one is interested in the service of religion to individuals and to

nations, he should read Psalms 113—118. Here we have a group of six poems assessing the value of religion, both to persons and to nations. These Psalms were written by a person or persons who had carefully observed the values accruing to people who were faithful in attending the three great feasts of the Jews — Passover, Pentecost and Tabernacles. These values may be stated as follows:

First. The transcendent God condescends to help needy men.

Two. This God can and does transform the most stubborn forces of nature and history into the servants of His people.

Third. Regardless of discouragement incident to the ridicule of one's enemies, one's personal experience of God's love and power enables him to keep his poise and to praise God.

Fourth. No one can praise God as effectively as can those who have clung to him in love and faith until prayers have been answered remedying desperate situations.

Fifth. A God of demonstrated Loving-Kindness and Truth must become the God of all nations.

Sixth. Though men, even kings and princes, may be unable to help the righteous in his conflict with seeming insurmountable problems, the historic God gives present evidence of His power and ability to help and to save.

If one is interested in finding language to express his thanksgiving for the blessings which accrue to him as the result of his faith in God, no better words can be found than those recorded in Psalm 103. Here we have a wonderful expression of joy and praise incident to answered prayer. There are no petitions. The whole of the poem is taken up with praise and thanksgiving. It reminds us that "in Creation's universal hymn of praise, each of us may and should contribute his part, however humble." Certainly here is a sincere picture of the joys and satisfactions arising out of a genuine experience of God's redemptive processes as they do their work in and for the individual.

If one is interested in knowing of the character of God and of the character of the Godlike man, he should read the twin Psalms 111 and 112. Here Psalm 111 celebrates in thanksgiving and praise God's power, goodness and righteousness. The thesis of the author is that those who delight in learning to understand God will find in His dealings with them evidences of His power, goodness and righteousness. Psalm 112 exploits



the virtue of the Godlike man. He finds that the processes of redemption work into men measurably the same characteristics found in God Himself. This redeemed man possesses in measure God's power, goodness and righteousness. The secret of all true happiness and prosperity for men is to be found in a reverence for God which produces in man an approximation of the character of God.

If one is interested in knowing the thrill incident to co-operative worship and co-operative work looking to bringing in God's Kingdom in the world, he should study the fifteen poems called the "Songs of Ascent." These are Psalms 120—134. These hymns were sung by groups of people as they moved in caravans from their homes to Jerusalem looking to attendance upon the great feasts of the Nation. Jesus was probably participating in the singing of these poems as He marched through Jericho en route to His last Passover, when He was interrupted by the cry of blind Bartimaeus. The themes of these fifteen hymns are thrilling and may be stated as follows and in order:

Psalm 120—Past personal experience of God's help through prayer gives one confidence to believe he can keep his religious poise in the midst of the influence of most ungodly people.

Psalm 121—Godly people are privileged to live their lives enjoying the thrill that all their undertakings and occupations are blessed and prospered by the God who made heaven and earth.

Psalm 122—A sense of having and being a part in the great enterprise of extending God's Kingdom is an incomparably thrilling experience.

Psalm 123—Suffering incident to the scorn and contempt of ungodly men finds its solace in the prayer of faith and love.

Psalm 124—History and present experience reveal victories for the righteous against such overwhelming odds that God's people are assured of God's co-operation.

Psalm 125—There is that in the experience of the truly godly man which develops an unshakable faith in the guardianship of God.

Psalm 126—Surely the God who has delivered Israel from the Babylonian Captivity will restore the fortunes of the re-established Kingdom.

Psalm 127—Without the blessing of the God who has promised to build the House of Israel and to be the watchman of His people, the most strenuous efforts of God's people to build and to guard are ineffective.

Psalm 128—Domestic and national happiness will be the lot of those

who fear and obey Jehovah's Laws. The welfare of the State depends upon the virtuous family. The family must be founded on an active religious principle.

Psalm 129—True experimental religion produces the one indestructible type of family and nation.

Psalm 130—A willing confession of sin is the entrance to an experience of God's forgiveness and blessing.

Psalm 131—One golden deposit incident to suffering is a spirit of resignation and contentment which waits patiently for the development of God's purposes.

Psalm 132—An intelligent knowledge of God's promises and confidence in His character transforms an academic faith into a present available asset.

Psalm 133—One of the most compelling powers for conversion of people to the true religion is the spirit of brotherly love which it produces among its adherents.

Psalm 134—When men are one in God, benedictions leap from man to man.

If one is interested in an evaluation of the character of God as expressed in His Law, he should read Psalm 119. Here there are twenty-two paragraphs—as many paragraphs as there are letters in the Hebrew alphabet. The intimation is that there are as many reasons for knowing, loving and following God's law as there are letters by which words can be created.

If one is interested in words to express the comforts incident to religion, he will find Psalms 23 and 27 thoroughly suited for such sentiments. Combining the sentiments in Psalms 119 and 23, one has pictured before him the three symbols of God's character. In the Holy of Holies, the Ark of the Covenant contained three things: the two tables of the Law, Aaron's Rod that budded, and a pot of manna. To the devout Jew, these three symbols meant that his God was as good as the Ten Commandments. He was as good as a perfect Shepherd, and He was as good as a perfect Host.

With this brief look at the content of the Psalter, one ceases to wonder that it persists in remaining the Prayer Book of Jews and Christians.

There are many Christians who would list the Psalms as their

favorite section of the Bible. They would agree with the early Christians in Britain who selected the Psalms as the first portion of the Bible to be translated into English. That they are not alone in this appreciation, is proved by a glance at what our forebears had to say.

BISHOP PEROWNE: "No single book of Scriptures, not even the New Testament, has ever taken such hold on the heart of Christendom. None, if we may dare judge, unless it be the Gospels, has had so large an influence in moulding the affections, sustaining the hopes, purifying the faith of believers. With its words, rather than with their own, they have come before God. In these they have uttered their desires, their fears, their confessions, their aspirations, their sorrows, their joys, their thanksgiving. By these their devotion has been kindled and their hearts comforted. The Psalter has been, in the truest sense, the Prayer Book both of Jews and Christians."

CHRYSOSTOM: "If we keep vigil in the Church, David comes first, last and midst. If early in the morning we seek for the melody of hymns, first, last and midst, is David again. If we are occupied with the funeral solemnities of the departed, if virgins sit at home and spin, David is first, last and midst. Many who had made but little progress in literature, many who have scarcely mastered its first principles, have the Psalter by heart. Nor is it in cities and churches alone that at all times, through every age, David is illustrious; in the midst of the forum, in the wilderness, and uninhabitable land, he excites the praises of God. In monasteries, amongst those holy choirs of angelic armies, David is first, midst and last. In the convents of virgins, where are the bands of them that imitate Mary, in the deserts, where are men crucified to this world, and having their conversation with God, first, midst and last is he. All other men are at night overpowered by natural sleep: David alone is active; and congregating the servants of God into seraphic bands, turns earth into heaven, and converts men into angels."

ATHANASIUS: "They seem to me a kind of mirror for every one who sings them, in which he may observe the motions of the soul, and as he observes them gives utterance to them in words. He who hears them read, takes them as if they were spoken specially for him. Stricken in his conscience, he repents, or hearing of hope in God, and of the grace which is given to those who believe, he rejoices as if this grace were promised to him in particular, and begins to thank God. He who genuinely

studies all that is written in this book of Divine inspiration may gather, as out of a paradise, that which is serviceable for his own need. Methinks that in the words of this book you may find an accurate survey and delineation of the whole life of man, the dispositions of the soul, and the movements of the mind. If a man has need of penitence and confession, if affliction or temptation has overtaken him, if he has been persecuted or has been delivered from the plots of his enemies, if he is in sorrow or trouble, or if he wishes to praise and give thanks and bless the Lord, he finds instruction in the Psalms. If thou meditate on these things and study the Psalms, thou shalt be able, under the guidance of the Spirit, to grasp their meaning; and thou shalt emulate the life of the divinely inspired men who utter these words."

BASIL: "All Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable, for it was written by the Spirit to the end that as it were in general hospital for souls, we human beings might each select the medicine for his own disease. The prophets provide one kind of instruction, the historians another, the law yet another, and the exhortations of the Proverbs yet another. But the Book of Psalms contains that which is profitable in all of them. It prophesies of the future; it recalls history; it legislates for life; it suggests rules for action; in a word, it is a common storehouse of good doctrines, providing exactly what is expedient for everyone. A Psalm is the calm of souls, the arbiter of peace: it stills the stormy waves of thought. It softens the angry spirit, and sobers the intemperate. A Psalm cements friendship: it unites those who are at variance; it reconciles those who are at enmity. For who can regard as an enemy the man with whom he has joined in lifting up one voice to God? Psalmody therefore provides the greatest of all good things, even love, for it has invented concerted singing as a band of unity, and fits the people together in the concord of one choir. A Psalm puts demons to flight: it summons the angels to our aid; it is a weapon in the midst of alarms by night, a rest from the toils of day; it is a safeguard for babes, a decoration for adults, a comfort for the aged, a most befitting ornament for women. It makes deserts populous and market places sane. It is an initiation to novices, growth to those who are advancing, confirmation to those who are being perfected. It is the voice of the Church; it gladdens festivals, it creates godly sorrow. For a Psalm calls forth tears even from a stony heart. A Psalm is the employment of angels, heavenly converse, spiritual

incense. What mayest thou not learn thence? The heroism of courage; the integrity of justice; the gravity of temperance; the perfection of prudence; the manner of repentance; the measure of patience; in a word, every good thing thou canst mention. Therein is a complete theology; the prediction of the advent of Christ in the flesh, the threatening of judgment, the hope of resurrection, the fear of chastisement, promises of glory, revelations of mysteries: all, as in some great public storehouse, are treasured up in the Book of Psalms."

AUGUSTINE: "In what accents I addressed Thee, my God, when I read the Psalms of David, those faithful songs, the language of devotion which banishes the spirit of pride, while I was still a novice in true love of Thee, and as a Catechumen rested in that country house along with Alypius, who was also a Catechumen, with my mother at our side, in the dress of a woman but with the faith of a man, with the calmness of age, the affection of a mother, the piety of a Christian. How I addressed Thee in those Psalms! How my love for Thee was kindled by them! How I burned to recite them, were it possible, throughout the world, as an antidote to the pride of humanity. Yet they are sung throughout the world, and there is none that hideth himself from Thy heat. How grieved and indignant was I with the Manichaeans! and yet again I pitied them for their ignorance of these sacraments, those medicines, and their mad rejection of the antidote which might have cured them of their madness. Would that they could have been somewhere near me without my knowledge and watched my face and heard my voice when I read the Fourth Psalm in that time of leisure, and have known the effect of that Psalm upon me. Would that they could have heard what I uttered between the words of the Psalm, without my knowing that they heard, how I spoke with myself and to myself before Thee out of the inmost feelings of my soul. I trembled for fear, and then I became fervent with hope and rejoicing in Thy mercy, O Father. And all these feelings issued forth by my eyes and voice."

MARTIN LUTHER: "You may rightly call the Psalter a Bible in miniature, in which all things which are set forth more at length in the rest of the Scriptures are collected into a beautiful manual of wonderful and attractive brevity. From the Psalms you may learn not the works of the saints only, but the words, the utterances, the groans, the colloquies, which they used in the presence of God, in temptation and in consolation;

so that though they are dead, in the Psalms they live and speak. The Psalms exhibit the mind of the saints; express the hidden treasure of their hearts, the working of their thoughts, and their most secret feelings."

JOHN CALVIN: "This book I am wont to call an anatomy of all the parts of the soul; for no one will find in himself a single feeling of which the image is not reflected in this mirror. Here the Holy Spirit has represented to the life all the griefs, sorrows, fears, doubts, hopes, cares, anxieties—in short, all the stormy emotions, by which human minds are wont to be agitated. The rest of Scripture contains the commands which God gave His servants to be delivered to us. Here the prophets themselves, in their converse with God, because they lay bare all their inmost feelings, invite or compel every one of us to examine himself, that none of all the infirmities to which we are subject may remain hidden. It is a rare and singular advantage when every secret recess is laid open, the heart purged from the foul plague of hypocrisy and brought to light."

RICHARD HOOKER: "The choice and flower of all things profitable in other books the Psalms do both more briefly contain, and more movingly also express, by reason of that poetical form wherewith they are written. What is there necessary for man to know which the Psalms are not able to teach? They are to beginners an easy and familiar introduction, a mighty augmentation of all virtue and knowledge in such as are entered before, a strong confirmation to the most perfect among others. Heroical magnanimity, exquisite justice, grave moderation, exact wisdom, repentance unfeigned, unwearied patience, the mysteries of God, the sufferings of Christ, the terrors of wrath, the comforts of grace, the works of Providence over this world, and the promised joys of that world which is to come, all good necessarily to be either known or done or had, this one celestial fountain yieldeth. Let there be any grief or disease incident into the soul of man, for which there is not in this treasure-house a present comfortable remedy at all times ready to be found."

DEAN STANLEY: "What is the history of the Church but a long commentary on the sacred records of its first beginnings? The actual effect, the manifold applications, in history, of the words of Scripture, give them a new instruction, and afford a new proof of their endless vigour and vitality. The Psalter alone, by its manifold applications and uses in aftertimes, is a vast palimpsest, written over and over again, illuminated, illustrated, by every conceivable incident and emotion of men



and nations; battles, wanderings, dangers, escapes, deathbeds, obsequies, of many ages and countries, rise, or may rise, to our view as we read it."

DEAN CHURCH: "In the Psalms we see the soul in the secret of its workings, in the variety and play of its many-sided and subtly compounded nature—loving, hoping, fearing, despairing, exulting, repenting, aspiring—the soul, conscious of the greatness and sweetness of its relations to Almighty God, and penetrated by them to the very quick; longing, thirsting, gasping, after the glimpses that visit it, of His goodness and beauty—awestruck before the unsearchableness of His judgment, silent before the certainty of His righteousness—opening, like a flower to the sun, in the presence of His light, of the immensity of His loving-kindness. They bring before us in all its fullness and richness the devotional element of the religious character. They are the first great teachers and patterns of prayer, and they show this side of the religious character in varied and finished detail, in all its compass and living and spontaneous force. The tongue is loosed to give utterance out of the abundance of the heart, to every mood, every contrasted feeling of the changeful human mind. From all the hidden depths, from all the strange and secret consciousnesses of the awakened and enlightened soul, spring up unexpected and vivid words, in which generation after generation has found the counterpart of its own convictions and hopes and joys, its own fears and distresses and perplexities and doubts, its own confidence and its own sorrow, its own brightest and darkest hours. This immense variety of mood and subject and occasion, with which the reverence and hope of worship are always combined, is a further point in the work of the Book of Psalms. It is a vast step in the revealing of man to man. We know how much we owe of the knowledge of ourselves to the great dramatists, to the great lyrical poets, to the great novelists. Such, in the unfolding to man of all that is really and most deeply involved in the religious character, is the place of the Book of Psalms."

A growing affection for and appreciation of the Psalms is a fair test of a person's religious development. Increasingly, a growing Christian finds in the Psalter a beautiful expression of his own changing moods as he orders his life under the blessing, guidance and love of a personal God, whom he sees in the face, hears in the voice and observes in the actions of Jesus. This Jesus remains "All that a man can be and all that God ought to be."

# French Civilization and French Collapse

FRIEDRICH WILHELM FOERSTER

## France's Separation From Europe

**T**HE great Pope who crowned Charlemagne found himself, just as the world of today, confronted with the German problem, with the German invasion over Europe and with the chaos resulting therefrom. He foresaw that Europe would be torn asunder by her enormous ethnic contrasts until a center of universal federation was created, able to realize the peaceful co-operation of many different ethnic elements. He also saw that first Europe had to be organized if ever Germany should be organized.

In his plan, the German Emperor was not supposed to be a German Overlord of Europe, such as Hitler aspires it today; but, as it were, the holder of an international office: the president of a league of nations whose function was to harmonize their equal rights. It became Germany's vocation to administer from her territory the tradition of Roman and Christian universality, to be the bridge between West and East, North and South—nothing more and nothing less.

The first supra-national human society of the Middle Ages was destroyed by the great religious conflict which splintered Europe and deepened her disunion by a devastating war of thirty years. Unhappily France took the lead in the gradual decomposition of the so-called Holy Roman Empire. This decomposition began at the very moment when the empire of Charlemagne was divided and France separated by her destinies from those of the rest of Europe, abandoning, by this withdrawing, the German world to her own chaotic temper and to all kinds of Asiatic influences. By the treaty of Werden 843, France reaped all the evils arising from this first division of European unity—this unity being the only solid protection of a highly spiritual race and her civilizing work.

There exists a "Sonette" edited just after this fatal separation and entitled "A Lamentation Over the Division of the Empire." The author was the deacon Florns of Lyon who foresaw all the consequences resulting from this event. He said: "The interest of the whole has been

forgotten, everyone is concerned only to defend his own right. The Empire is like a wall plainly threatened with destruction. It has lost its equilibrium. The cement has fallen out. All its parts are shaky."

One can say that the thunder of the German artillery before Verdun (Werden), the hecatombs of French and German soldiers offered on its battlefields, were the result of this original division. "The interest of the whole has been forgotten." This statement became the tragedy of France. Certainly it was a European tragedy. The French philosopher, August Comte, called this individualism, this passion for separatism, "the Occidental sickness." But it was, in a particular sense, the French sickness and the very cause of France's degeneration and collapse. The individualistic principle, reinforced by a certain anarchic tendency in the highly gifted Celtic race, dominated the inner life and European policy of the country. "Laissez nous tranquilles" became the motto of this unique civilization. France sent the scent of the flowers of her gardens over all of Europe, but the demonic forces working in the depth of European history could not be tamed with perfume and the day was coming when an abandoned Europe would look for revenge.

Richelieu came from that region of France where the peasants protected their property by a high stone wall. This policy he adopted as his own. Instead of trying to reorganize Europe, he established a mere Maginot policy of defense. He succeeded in disintegrating the German colossae but just the anarchic state into which he threw Germany offered the most favorable possibility to Prussia's "German vocation" which she fulfilled until complete annexation. Hitler annihilated the work of Richelieu and the Nazis boast of this very achievement.

The famous French historian, Bainville, wrote in his book, *The History of Two Nations*: "France developed and perfected herself while Germany decayed and decomposed. To promote and to ensure German anarchy was the masterpiece of French policy in the Seventeenth Century, which crowned the toil and achievements of many generations and ultimately meant the triumph of France. France henceforth could live without fear side by side with her dangerous neighbor who had been placed in a state of unarmed impotence." Is this cold-blooded language not terrifying in its unconcern for the nations beyond the French frontiers which were abandoned to their dissolution, as though the living could sleep with corpses and not succumb to the poison of their corruption?

**French Individualism and German Organization**

Renan has said, "When once France and Germany will reconcile themselves the two halves of the human soul will be united." This is extremely true. The German and the French qualities are not *contrary* but *complementary*. They are dependent on co-operation. Their separation will always be mortal for Europe and for themselves. The French philosopher, E. Boutroux, said in May, 1914, in a lecture given at the University of Berlin, "France is the guardian of the values of human personality, while Germany has devoted herself to the relation of the individual to the whole." But every kind of organization which neglects the values and rights of human personality is doomed to failure and must end in the rising of the collective beast. And on the other hand, the one-sided defense of the rights of man and the neglecting of man's duty and responsibility, leads a people not less astray and produced inevitably social and political disintegration.

The great French Revolution was an outburst of the mere individualistic and even anarchic spirit. It created an almost incurable schism between the two Frances radically opposed to each other. Between the Jacobins championing the rights of man and the upholders of the conservative traditions of the country, there was no bridge of understanding. The one-sided revolutionary tradition has deprived the Frenchman of his Fatherland. There is no more a common Fatherland. A French aristocrat whom I asked after the defeat how he explained this rapid and unexpected collapse, answered me without shame and hesitation, "We did not want to fight for the country of Mr. Daladier." The English-leading classes on the other hand, always learned from a revolution and tried to win back the groaning masses. They were capable of examining the national conscience, of adapting themselves to new conditions and responsibilities. The French conservative classes kept aside and waited on the catastrophe of modern France. The French have only a noblesse. The English have an aristocracy, that is to say, a noblesse that remained in power, because they had thoroughly revised and transformed the energizing of their powers and the interpretation of their tradition.

The radicals in their wild departure from the past committed no less a fault. Above all in the realm of public education, the so-called "esprit laïque" was cutting off the whole spiritual experiences of religious France.

The divisions of the nation resulting therefrom are clearly visible in almost every village. One half belongs to the priest, the other to the radical or communist teacher. Lucien Ramier in his book, *Interpretation of Our Time*, describes this state of things in the following:

"The separation of the school from tradition has thrown our people into complete uncertainty as to the deepest foundations of their existence. It made us all improvisers. By this evolution the past has become in the mind of the masses, ridiculous, worthless and even detestable. Most essential sentiments have been cut off from their root. Once the people, guardians of tradition and guarded by it, conserved the customs and the salutary experience of the past; while aristocracy and bourgeoisie represented the progress. Since the simple people are separated from tradition, it is seized by a confused and misled desire for new programs at any price, while the upper classes give themselves to reactionary inclinations."

This separation of the leading intellectual caste is not a result of the French revolution and its abstractions. It was prepared since the Middle Ages by the world-wide reputation of the University of Paris, during centuries the intellectual center of Europe, the glory of French culture. The French have become the most intelligent people of the world but they excelled too much in an abstract kind of intelligence; remote from life, remote from the people, remote from tradition. And so the same intelligence which first served the Church, finally served religious decomposition. This fact was already stated by Goethe during his stay in Strasburg. It turned him back from French civilization to German traditions. No doubt this aberration will be cured. There are wonderful and inexhaustible sources of true Christian life in France, particularly in the southwest. These forces will, together with those of the Russian people, one day greatly contribute to the new Christianization of Europe. The true Frenchman is so penetrated by long Christian influence that no aberration can be lasting. In a French free-thinker there is still more Christian formation of the soul than in many Catholic Teutons whose wild political paganism corrupted their whole Christian education. "We are from yesterday," remarked Goethe. The French are from a very old past. They are kept and held by a timeless civilization.

#### Political France

An American woman who married an Australian took with her to her farm some of her favored cactus. These cacti spread so rapidly and overwhelmingly that finally the government had to open a crusade in

order to clean the whole region. Why did the cactus spread so illimitably instead of observing American law and order? Because its enemies had been left in America.

It is the same with the importation to the European continent of British parliamentary institutions. They degenerated there because the counterweights they had in English character and English tradition would not also be transferred to the continent. The English parliamentary system, detached from those counterweights did enormous harm to the French nation and not only to her but to Europe in general. It did not fit with the French character. It could not be reconciled with French tradition. It did not give the right expression to the nature of French liberty. It fostered the Celtic, anarchic tendency and gave the pretext for the return of Caesar. The Frenchman is not at all a political being; so he misused politics as a kind of business or as a means for the dialectic game of ideologies. French individualism came in and transformed the parliament into a war of all against all.

In a certain modern French company a man seeks in vain for the greatest and most degrading insult for his enemy. At last he shouts, "You deputy, you!" In England the enemy would feel much honored by that qualification.

The almost incredible want of adequate preparation in face of the German military menace was also a result of the unfitness of the whole political system. One must, therefore, bear in mind that the present reaction in France is not only imposed by a dictator but is the result of the enormous disillusion as to the capacity of present democratic institutions to assure to a nation threatened by a mortal danger the force of rapid conclusions and decisions. The very fact that the true situation was completely known to all political and military experts but did not provoke necessary measures, proved undoubtedly that the actual French democracy, as Tardieu stated in his last writings, represented a phase of *complete disintegration of the different social functions*. There was no *collusion of knowledge and action, no center of the true political conscience*, the ever-changing majorities with their ever-changing governmental expressions were absolutely in the way of the development of the feeling of moral responsibility for the destiny of the nation.

In 1935 Paul Renaud asked, "Has France the army of her policy?" He denied it passionately. In face of ten German tank divisions, he



demanded from the parliament at least six divisions. The parliament refused. The nation had to pay for that blindness and felt, after the defeat, that his political system was not equal to the task.

### France, a Victim of False Pacifism

The General Moltke wrote in the fatal days of July, 1914, to the Austrian Marshal Conrad von Hochendorff: "France is directly in military embarrassment. The just moment has come to venture the war." Who was responsible for the military embarrassment of France? The false and abstract pacifism which ignored the Prussian mentality and was drowned in a thousand illusions.

The French had a man who knew the realities and could have saved the country from its embarrassment. He was Clemenceau. At the peace conference, his knowledge of Germany, and Wilson's ignorance of the realities beyond the Rhine encountered each other. Clemenceau, looking on the immense devastation of his country wanted a peace of consolidated security. Wilson, looking on the immense devastation of the economic world, wanted a stabilized international order and insisted on a "peace of justice and reconciliation." He did not realize that the dominant mentality in Germany, the dynamic minority, would misuse all generosity, equality and liberty only for preparing its badly interrupted war of conquest of Europe. Wilson and Clemenceau paralyzed each other. That final peace was neither a peace of reconciliation, nor a peace of safety. The guarantee was merely on paper and the false pacifism of Geneva continued the fatal error. One disarmed the police and ignored the rearmament of the international gangsters until it was too late. Clemenceau said of Stresemann, "Il nous a roulés—la France est perdue." But one must not forget that behind the pacifism of betrayed France (*la France roulée*) there was not only weakness and blindness but also a great human tradition. The outburst of this tradition after the great slaughter had another value before God and mankind, as the insidious pacifism of the German negotiators who were seeking only for the disarmament of the police.

Briand was a pacifist Jacobin, a spokesman of French revolutionary abstractions, who applied the gospel of world-liberating reason to the problem of universal peace. He expressed with a passionate eloquence and in the language of world revolution, his burning desire for peace, a

desire elemental, simple, eternally human of all who had fought in the war, of all mothers and wives, fathers and grandfathers after the slaughter. For a time, he seemed the spokesman of the entire nation. No one opposed him. The world replied like an echo from mountain crags.

But *he was ignorant of Europe*. He had no knowledge of the diabolic forces working in the defeated nation nor of the immovable aims of the true lords of Germany. So he was seduced by a false optimism into the Locarno policy which lulled Europe and France to sleep with unreal guarantees and encouraged the Germans to demand equal treatment before the moral conditions had been realized. This pacifism which thought to conquer the bull by playing the flute was totally incapable of dealing with the gigantic problem of a new international order. The French have a fabulous inclination for illusions. It is a Greek inheritance. The Greek element is very strong in southern France. Three years before the war, I gave a lecture before an audience of professors and diplomats in Paris and told them all I knew by intimate information, about the extension of German rearmament. Later, an eminent scholar asked me, "But can you give us for the night an outlook more in rosa?"

Two years before the war, the Protestant congress in Montpellier had invited me to speak on the Nazi peril. I told them the truth but when I drew the conclusion and said, "Rearmer à toute force!" the whole congress was against me. The first speaker said, "But do you not know that France must defend herself by her spirituality?" I asked, "By what spirituality, and how against tanks?" I quoted Paul's words, "The carnal man does not understand what is of the spirit." And I explained that a mentality that does not answer to the spiritual appeal must be tamed with the means that are equal to the task—all was in vain.

In the excellent report of a French journalist, entitled, "France Speaking," the author, R. de Saint Jean, says very justly: "Perhaps it is because France is too highly civilized that her war morale is so often ill-assured. Love of peace, of culture, has come to blunt the tough side of our character; the very toughness which democracies must possess (as well as others) when they have to fight."

After the Great War, a French actor "ancien combattant," said to me: "You must not forget that for us this war was from the psychological standpoint incomparably more destructive than for you. For you Germans war is the fulfillment of your essential aspiration, a great test for character, the opened door to limitless domination. For us it was the

most terrible contradiction to all that we cherish, to the very meaning of our tradition, to the strongest sentiments of our nature. Therefore, war destroyed our nervous system much more than yours. Even its memory continues to arouse our rebellion and to fill our soul with horror. Never again! Never again!"

This is the truth. It is one of the reasons why this France was defeated. The members of a highly civilized nation cannot fight the Prussian war machine and its hardened brutality unless they take it as an unavoidable crusade and prepare themselves thoroughly and without any spiritual reserve. But there was not a single Frenchman who knew how to inspire such a crusade. They all slept and avoided facing the realities and taking moral decisions.

This France, driven too far toward a wholly unprepared war by a policy of bluff and of outward promptitude without any serious moral resolution in the midst of a divided nation, finally declared war; but without hope and enthusiasm and was secretly even sabotaging any earnest effort to organize a war which to her mind was lost before it began.

All this is typical of the whole confused state of mind prevailing in the Western world, in face of Germany's resolute will to impose her armed might on Europe. Therefore, the Nazis were singing, "They tremble, the rotten bones of the world, for today we have Germany and tomorrow the entire world."

#### The Eternal Values of French Civilization

The evolution of French civilization has been favored by many extraordinary advantages. First: France became the heir of the whole Mediterranean civilization, this civilization being thus received by a race of great spiritual gifts. The Gallic country was colonized not only from Rome but also from the Greek colony, Massilia. The influence of this colony on the southern population was most penetrating. I once heard in a public discussion, a speaker protesting against the saying, "The French are Latins." He replied, "No, we are Greeks." And there is no doubt that the Greek element in French civilization is not less strong than the Roman element. In "la France du midi" this fact expresses itself even physically in the faces. It is well known that the majority of the women of Arles have the Greek oval face. This Hellenic influence transmitted also to the very passionate Celtic race the old Greek virtue of the just measure in all things; the taste for a modest life, the horror

against every kind of exaggeration and haughtiness, even against overstatements and superlatives in literary expression. In no other country has the Greek humanism, not as philology, but as a social refinement of the soul, taken such deep root. After the Great War, many Germans summed up their experiences made in the occupied towns and villages by the words, "They behaved like homeric Greeks, purely human."

The Roman influence was overwhelming in the first centuries—but it could be so overwhelming because imperial Rome had been mitigated and humanized by Greek humanism. This has been described by Mommsen in his Roman history. Rome became the pioneer of Hellenistic culture. Therefore, Gallic (Celtic) poets like Ausonius praised Imperial Rome as the protector of the weak; Rome favored Gallic national festivals, instead of suppressing national traditions. Big flourishing cities like Tolosa (a Roman theatre for twenty-five thousand persons gives an idea of the standard) rose in all parts of the country. Greek and Roman art and science were eagerly adopted.

The Roman influence had a particular educational value for the individualistic Celt. Maurras exalted this influence by saying: "If I were not a Roman, I would not be a Frenchman. I am Roman, because if my ancestors had not been Roman, the invasions of the barbarous people between the fifth and tenth century would have made me a kind of German or Norwegian. I am Roman because the Rome of the Priests and Popes has completed and spiritualized the work of the legions, of the administrators and of the legislators of Rome by giving us the inflexible strength of our convictions, of our manners, our language and our religious cult."

A south France lady said to me: "My husband is a Celt. He is candid, generous, confident; but he does not know the world and its cunningness. I am Latin. I know the world. We Latins are given to the Celts in order to protect them against the world." After the Celtic explosion of the French Revolution, the Roman Bonaparte re-established order and equilibrium.

But the lead of the Roman element was never accepted for a longer period by the French. The French are not at all Imperialist. The tomb of Napoleon at whose feet Europe once lay is not a shrine of French patriotism. No rousing speeches have ever been delivered there. No lamp burns night and day. The center of French patriotism is not there,

but in the cult of the Maid of Orleans, symbol of mere defensive armament. The saint has put the conqueror into the shade. If we think over the significance of this fact, we shall understand the whole difference between France and Germany.

He who wants to understand the very essence of French civilization must read Virgil. Virgil's poems exalt the *Mediterranean ideal of life*, embodied in the royal peasant of Tarent who is proud that there is nothing on his table that he did not produce himself. That is the Mediterranean ideal: the "petit cultivateur" who loves the simple, modest life, without luxury, the life outside of gigantic techniques, the ultimate connection with nature, the grateful co-operation with her, the eternal joys of this simple exchange of giving and taking.

I asked a French woman who had developed a little restaurant on the Boulevard Saint Germain (Paris) up to a very high standard: "You will surely buy the house and have a great hotel?" She answered, "No, not at all. If we have gained enough, we shall buy a little farm and have 'la vie modeste à la campagne.'" This answer shows the whole difference between the German "Faust" with his eternal unrest and constructive fury (which becomes rapidly destructive!) and the Virgilean French who prefer the simple life with nature and its eternal values and pleasures.

A great part of actual French degeneration and misery comes from the abandoning of France's true tradition. The Frenchman is not created for Germanism and Americanism and the world needs him as a holy counterweight against the constructors of the towers of Babel.

It was a great pity that toward the end of the Nineteenth Century France began to lose her confidence in herself and to worship German ideals and successes. Gobineau tried to persuade his country fellows that the inferiority of France was due to the fact that she was more Romanized than England and Germany. This aberration is now at its height. The return to the sources of true French life will come, but the whole world must help. It has too long abandoned that wonderful garden of human culture. The restoration and efficient protection of France will be one of the most important tasks of a future peace.

## Religion in Stone

RALPH ADAMS CRAM

THE connection between religion and art of every sort and kind is intimate and immemorial. When the first architect of record, Imhotep of Egypt, *circa* 3000 B. C. created not only the architecture of Egypt but also the art itself for ages to come, his first work was the temple at Edfu (long since superseded by later work); tradition holds that it seemed so miraculous to the people of the time, they believed it was constructed from plans "handed down from Heaven."

The point to be noted here is that architecture began in the service of religion. So it continued, as its primary function, through more than two thousand years of Egyptian history, five centuries of Hellenic culture and, though with diminishing prominence (except in the case of the Middle Ages when it again achieved priority) well down to the inception of the Modern Age.

From this earliest function of creative art, the honoring and worship of Divinity, art immediately filtered into secular life, for its value and potency as one of the "natural rights" of man had been revealed through its service of religion, and for more than four thousand years it was the great heritage of mankind. Indeed, though with "a dying fall," it still manifests its appeal and its power, though only here and there, and through lonely individuals, not through popular demand, universal sympathy or potential creative ability. So, after an honorable, and frequently glorious, record of 4,500 years, this power, both creative and revealing, comes to its end. By faith we know this is not final, and that, in time, man will recover for himself this attribute of humanity, without which he is imperfect and incomplete.

In the train of architecture, all the other arts followed on—sculpture, painting, music and liturgics. Architecture still remained, for many centuries, the master and co-ordinating art, and its prime function the declaration of the reality and supremacy of Divine Power, the obligation of worship, and the stimulation of devotion. Art, in the service of religion, was release, exaltation and, in a real sense, revelation.

"Religion in stone." Yes, certainly, because the native instinct in



man prompts him to offer to God, in a material way, only the most precious and enduring things; no trivial, cheap or perishable objects or materials. At Sakkarah this same Imhotep transformed clay, wattle and mud-brick into enduring stone, and great therefore must be his glory. Perhaps he was not only the first but the greatest architect that ever lived, for behind him lay no precedents whatsoever; no models on which to work; nothing but the megalithic dolmens of the proto-men of the Paleolithic Age. He was certainly the only man, with the exception of Anthemius of Tralles, builder of Hagia Sophia, who, singlehanded, created a new architectural style.

From this time on, granite and freestone, marble and hard brick, were the only materials out of which temples and churches were built, except in the Far East where, for good reasons, wood was used instead. And what man did with these, the very bones and the product of the Earth, is in itself sufficient proof that somewhere in his physical humanity there is a spark of Divine creativeness.

I suppose that one ten-thousandth part of the religious architecture that men have fashioned, still stands even in mutilated form. Nature, except in the tropical jungles (forbidden lands in any case) has been gentle and considerate (earthquakes excepted) and has only spread the patina of venerable age on these old monuments. It is the "total depravity" of the human race—at least the greater part, and at all times—that has blasted and obliterated so much of the glory man had achieved and revealed in himself. In spite of this wide ruin and desolation, enough remains to record man at one of the highest points he has ever achieved.

Number a few of the masterpieces of supreme architecture: Sakkarah and Karnak; Parthenon and Erechtheon; Hagia Sophia in Constantinople; Saint Mark's in Venice and the Capella Palatina in Palermo. It would be invidious to choose from the myriad churches of the Middle Ages, salient examples, but, in the midst of many, call to mind Bourges, Chartres, Amiens and Albi in France; Seville, Toledo and Palma in Spain; Westminster, Exeter, Gloucester and any one of the ruined abbeys of England. And this is not to speak of the Cambodian Angkor or the Japanese Nara, Chion-in or Horiuji. And there are still a thousand more. Today man uses his imagination and his power of invention to devise an internal combustion engine, and so the motor car, the airplane, the submarine, and the war tank, or giant machines to smash the atom

or delicate mechanisms to measure to the millionth of an inch. He builds telescopes that penetrate into interstellar space, telephones and instruments of incredible precision, moving-picture cameras and exquisite surgical instruments, electric razors and ten thousand other labor-eliminating gadgets, and we marvel at his ingenuity, but can he create a Taj Mahal, a Venus of Milo, a "Sacred and Profane Love" or a Fifth Symphony? The answer is in the negative.

And of all the arts in which, for the first time in his long history he most signally fails, architecture, which is in a sense the basic art, his inadequacy is most conspicuous, yet it is the art in which, in the past, he has most clearly shown his power of creation.

Browning, in "Abt Vogler," which is a far better essay on art than any professor, student or critic has ever written, has his master of music say:

"But here is the finger of God, a flash of the will that can,  
Existent behind all laws that made them and, lo, they are!  
And I know not if, save in this, such gift be allowed to man  
That out of three sounds he frame, not a fourth sound, but a star."

There has always been a mysterious kinship between music and architecture. I don't know how or why, but there it is. It is possible, therefore, and most lawful, to apply what Browning says of music to the kindred art of architecture and, paraphrasing Franz Abt's meditation say, "And I know not if, save in this, such gift be allowed to man," that out of the inert matter of stones and stocks and clods he can frame the living and breathing fabric of an Amiens Cathedral or an Hagia Sophia.

This is of course especially true of all architecture that has been consciously created in the service of religion and to the glory of God. Today when religion has weakened as a creative force (although only for the moment, we hope and believe), the building of churches is often for the purpose of denominational rivalry or to satisfy the pride of an ingenious and, frequently anarchistically radical architect, Doktor Abt's beliefs are inoperative.

We already have more than enough examples of this sort of thing in the United States, most of them thus far, curiously enough, Roman Catholic. I have no intention of identifying them, but refer anyone who wishes to see how far we have fallen from the ancient and inviolable standards, to the Evangelical churches in Germany and the Catholic

churches in France that have come into existence within the last twenty-five or thirty years. If you are looking for "religion in stone" you will not find it here, for they all grew out of the ethos of a mechanized and materialistic age as naturally as broken treaties and bombing planes.

And to consider another point, "Religion in Stone" is descriptive only insofar as it applies to the past. Stone, except as it is still used by communities and individuals commonly called "reactionary" is no longer a fashionable material; it isn't "modern" enough (how could it be since it is of the very bowels of the earth?); it costs too much, and it lasts too long. We do not build now for the ages, but only for the brief space of time that endures until the encroachments of business, or the dictates of fashion demand change to another site. As Sir Thomas Browne hath it in his *Hydriotaphia*:

"Grave stones tell truth scarce forty years. Generations pass while some trees stand, and old families last not three oaks."

The old builders did not think of this but we are more fortunate than they for we have iron and steel, ferro-concrete, structural glass, plastics and a lot of other substitutes, while the possibilities of the cantilever and the catenary curve are infinite and irresistible. They have one merit: they are probably less permanent than marble and stone—but a steel-framed building with a cement finish makes a very unhandsome ruin.

Is there merit in talking and writing today about these things that were? Action would be more to the point, but what is there to do? For thirty years we have had no lack of warning as to what was in store for us and for the peculiar sort of civilization we have been so avidly building for so many years; Spengler, Ortega y Gasset, Berdyaev, Salvador de Madariaga, as well as very many others who are now following on, have made this all perfectly clear, and now world revolution pursues its devastating course to verify all they have said, "that the prophecy might be fulfilled." All that was written has fallen on deaf ears, and even now, as destiny works itself out, only a few see the logic of the process of destruction. It is, as Berdyaev says, "the end of our time." Turn to the Second Epistle of Paul to Timothy; for even when this was written there was the clear forewarning of the end of another time.

"This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud,

blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection; truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good; traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of Godliness, but denying the power thereof; from such turn away. For of this sort are they which creep into houses and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts, ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."

We know now that there are many "last days" and that this we are experiencing with "great tribulation" is only the latest in order. Probably there is little or nothing we can do to stay or change the course of the events that have been predetermined—certainly talking and writing will not do it—but time, like everything else, is now streamlined, and it cannot be long now before this particular era is accomplished. What then? Undoubtedly a new five-hundred-year period better than this last, and to this we must look forward and prepare, insofar as we can.

One generation has created, and another has destroyed; a systole and dyastole that seems to run through all life. We are now experiencing destruction, as for so many times in the past, but this only clears the ground for a new beginning. Berdyaev says that the next period will be far more like the five centuries that preceded our own time than this time itself, which would be quite in accordance with the rhythm of history. He does not mean that the next era will be in any respect a copy of medieval times but that, once chaos has passed, there will be a readjustment of standards, "a transvaluation of values," and that those things that were put first in the Middle Ages, will be put first again.

Amongst these is the acceptance of religion as a basic fact in life, interpenetrating life itself in all its manifestations and activities. If this is true then, certainly, we must guard and preserve whatever we can of those monuments of an old religion that are still left to us. More than this, we should see that what we do now in expressing "religion in stone" is significant, consistent and, above all else, evocative. As I have said before, there has been of late a tendency to forget all this. Much of what we have done recently has been time-serving, egotistical, even anarchical. During the great cultural periods of the past it has been quite otherwise, and what was done then showed itself with power.

For great art of every sort is not only a manifestation of vitality,

sincerity and creative energy, it is also a dynamic force that incites and creates. Of course, under the law of vibration, rhythm and periodicity, it has no lasting endurance; it is for a time only. For there is no evolution without its corresponding devolution.

Regarded superficially, this, our present time, would seem to be one of disasters and the ending of all things. So it is, in a sense, but it is not only an ending, it is also a beginning and it is on this aspect of the situation that it would be well for us to fix our attention. The general débâcle now in process will work itself out after its own fashion, and there is little if anything we can do about it. We have made our bed and we must lie on it through a darkness shot with nightmares, but already—

"There is dawn on the uttermost mountains  
Pale dawn on the edge of the world"

and we can make ready for that. For as William Morris made John Ball say:

"Ill would it be at whiles, were it not for the change beyond the change."

It is to "the change beyond the change" that we now look forward, and so looking, gain strength to endure what we, and our fathers before us, have brought upon us. Like Socrates, in another time not unlike our own, we can only "stand aside under the wall while the storm of dust and dead leaves goes by." Another generation will have the welcome opportunity of building a new era on the wide ruin we ourselves have wrought.

## Do or Die: The "Christian" Colleges

EDWIN E. AUBREY

**H**IGHER education in America faces a dark future. Money is harder to get every year and will be still harder to get in the years ahead. Endowment funds yield sharply reduced returns; and the prospects of any gain to the college treasuries from the defense boom (now the treacherous Messiah of many worry-weary minds) are offset by the tremendous tax burden. For the same reason wealthy donors find surplus looking more and more like the Cheshire cat's smile, and feel unable to make munificent contributions to higher education.

Consequently, our institutions of higher learning are looking more and more to tuition fees and to small annual contributions for new income. But with a great tax increase in the offing for the ordinary man, we cannot expect much from these sources.

On the other hand, costs are rising, and the budgets of our colleges will have to be larger, especially if the government plan for old-age insurance is applied to college employees as well. Since most smaller colleges now operate with a very narrow margin, these added expenses may well prove to be the last straw, and many will have to give up.

It is certain that our whole national attitude which has blithely welcomed new colleges will come in for radical, and increasingly skeptical, re-examination. At a time when businesses are merging for mutual deliverance from bankruptcy, and centralization is the order of the day, many questions will be raised as to the justification of so many small colleges. When a hundred miles was a long journey, institutions had to be thickly distributed to be easily available. The auto has changed all this; and the post-war flivver plane will change it still more. Do we need so many institutions of higher learning?

"Not when they have to struggle along with understaffed, overworked and poorly paid faculties," say our educators. Inferior higher education is a menace, because it breeds a false confidence in young people. A college degree is no longer a passport to economic success, or to social competence.

Other social students point to the incidence of college men among



our criminals, and wonder whether a college-trained racketeer is better than an ignorant but honest laborer. One thing is sure: our educational program is not doing its job for the country on the side of providing moral leadership; and higher education is losing its prestige. Vigorous criticisms from within are exposing its weak side to the public, just when a case has to be made for public support. It is not surprising, then, if many say that the college is not worth its salt.

Faced by this situation the Christian college has been hard put to it to present a convincing case for support. Efforts to make capital of its *Christian* character prove unconvincing, when the most casual observer can see in many a successful denominational college a rich man's country club, and in the struggling sectarian institution an organization unable to maintain the standards requisite and resorting either to unethical subterfuges or to equally unethical "squeezes" to give the appearance of academic competence, and forced into unethical practices to recruit students. Claims to special value are based on an attenuated connection with some denomination which does not really furnish a substantial percentage of the student body nor place the stamp of its own religious heritage on the life of the students. Holy appellations are sometimes made to the Christian character of the faculty, many of whom may not be darkening the door of any church, expressing any single sentiment regarding spiritual values, or engaging in any determination of college policies. Sometimes a formal item of compulsory chapel or required biblical work or membership of all students in a Christian organization is pointed to as an index of Christian influence. I have spoken to some of these compulsory chapel assemblies and felt the indifference or even hostility of the audience so keenly that it was agony to speak at all. I have seen the work in some of the "snap courses" in Bible, and the dreary formalism of the compulsory religious organization. There is often little Christianity in them, and, what is worse, they breed hostility or contempt for Christianity.

What possibilities of Christian influence are present in formal devices such as I have mentioned, are often overwhelmed by the effect upon the students of seeing administrative policy from inside the college. The beautiful lounges in the dormitories, the wonderfully landscaped campuses, the impressive façades of laboratories and lecture halls, are to them a deceptive "front" for dirty basements suffering from inadequate maintenance. The grandiose total budget conceals an item of less than 50%

for instruction. Petty money-making fees swell the already large tuition, room-and-board costs in ways suspiciously reminiscent of schemes that in any ordinary community would call for investigation by the Better Business Bureau. Even where the expenses are quite clearly and explicitly stated in the catalogue, the scale of values reflected in administrative decisions is, to say the least, not guilty of excessive Christian idealism. Young folk know sham when they see it; and I have heard them refer to their own president in a large church college as "a shyster lawyer."

Two things must be said in fairness to the college administrators. First, this dark picture is not universally true. There are many fine denominational colleges doing a splendid piece of education, and run on lines of sound and ethical business and academic practice. Besides, where these other conditions prevail, the public is largely responsible. *We* have exerted the pressure for finer buildings, deeper armchairs, larger stadiums and better shrubbery. It was a part of our simple-minded reliance on externals, of our childish concern for showy results.

Is it any wonder if the colleges became themselves a gaudy sham, stamping on the students committed to them the marks of a selfish, cheap, superficial materialism? Where was now the Christian influence?

Is it any wonder that we have to put quotation marks around the word "Christian" when we speak of a Christian college today? Yet never was the need of Christian centers of higher education greater. Writing in 1837, Alexander Campbell gave a cautious, and some might think belated, approval to the year-old Bacon College:

"I have been backward hitherto to say much about this institution until I could ascertain from a personal interview with its principal managers and conductors, their views and designs, their prospects and means, etc., but especially with reference to the discipline and moral culture under which the youth are to be placed who attend this college; for this, with me, now is above all other sorts of eminence. I give my vote for knowledge, but I would not give morality for them all."

We may want to make allowance for the greater degree of parental control in his day, and the restrictive rôle of the college acting as guardian of its "wards." But the emphasis is sound. It states a criterion badly needed in higher education today, "discipline and moral culture . . . above all other sorts of eminence."

Here is the challenge for the college: to develop a combination of intelligence and moral stamina in the nation's future leaders. We

face dark clouds that will soon break on our heads. This war, whether we are in it or not, will bring its backwash of cynicism and bewilderment, and in the cross currents of lies and hatred many will go down. Whether America can stand in the floods will depend on whether our house is builded on sand, or founded on a deeper stratum of rock. Without deeper foundations we cannot make any cultural habitation worth the name.

Who shall build us such foundations? They are built in the heart by a long and delicate process of family nurture. They come to clear consciousness in the mind in the critical studies of high school and college. They acquire rational standing in the philosophy of life which the student develops under the guidance of the professor in the classroom, and under the subtle pressure of student standards and administrative attitudes in the life of the college community. The trouble is that this all-important education is now caught in confusion and contradiction in our higher educational centers; and our educated voters are largely either indifferent or incapable of furnishing national leadership. Who among us would, if the United States policies were ours to determine, know clearly our aims for our country's future? Peace? Yes. But a peace without growth is stagnation. Freedom? Of course. But freedom without responsibility is anarchy. Security? Definitely. But a security that is shallow is only a trap. Plenty? Perhaps. Though plenty without prudence is mere national gluttony. Justice? Decidedly. But justice is rooted in sacrifice as well as in rights.

Peace, freedom, security, plenty, justice: these are empty words until there is breathed into them the creative spirit of religion. By religion I mean holding a view of the universe which gives intelligible meaning and grounding to moral ideals, and dedicating our lives to the faith that this view of the universe is sound. This is a task for our colleges and universities above all. To the Christian colleges falls the special task of clarifying the meaning of a Christian society and training potential leaders in the attitudes required to make them capable of public service in terms of Christian ideals and faith.

This means first of all that we must reverse the policy of the pre-depression years when higher education was a social habit rather than a privilege. We must make sure that the candidates for admission to our colleges are *worth* educating further. Money is too scarce and the cost too high to warrant indiscriminate higher education. The funds

are held in trust, and must not be wasted on the unworthy. Furthermore, the presence on our campuses of students who have no clear or serious purpose is a handicap to the education of the others. I realize that the overexpansion of physical plants in many colleges is an obstacle to any such brave curtailment; but perhaps some of the available building space may be used for junior colleges. But select we must, and much more carefully.

It means, in the second place, that the Christian college must bow to none in the quality of its intellectual work. To maintain a so-called Christian college whose intellectual standards are weak is immoral. A moral obligation rests on Christian educators to keep high the quality of intellectual discipline. The alternative to academic excellence is not indifferently good work, but real demoralization of young people. For the church college to demoralize students is betrayal of its cause.

Academic standards are not the whole story. The registrar's office will not record the salvation of our ailing colleges any more than will the comptroller's office. College life is a community life. To the extent that our colleges are simply classroom instructional centers they are seriously weakened. If it be true that, as President Hutchins says, "a university is a community of scholars," then the full meaning of this community must be understood. In the Christian college this must become a *Christian* community. Now, what is a Christian community?

Three answers are usually given to this question. First, it is asserted that a community dominated by the Church is a Christian community. But if this means simply the denominational sponsoring of a college, or the teaching of particular doctrinal tenets, or the maintenance of a faculty with church connection, the term does not carry us far enough. It may mean nothing more than that the college is listed in the denominational report, in exchange for a deference of the administration to ecclesiastical leaders. This may even degenerate into a mere bow in the direction of Christianity, such as grace before meals, prayers at convocations, or a pious phrase or two in the president's report.

A second possibility is that a Christian college may be conceived in terms of Coleridge's great dream of a century ago, which Thomas Arnold made the basis for the Rugby School of the era of *Tom Brown's School-days*. This would be a college in which students are trained for self-discipline and leadership through Christian ideals inculcated in them

daily in the course of life on the campus with careful, paternalistic supervision. Student standards would thus take on a formal Christian character in fixed patterns of conduct such as honesty, considerateness, fairness, social responsibility, loyalty and tenacity. Such a program requires that the student body be overwhelmingly resident students, so that the impact of these standards is continuous throughout the waking hours. Turning out men and women of such a mold, the institution might exert a noticeable influence on the public life of a state or nation, with the passing of the years.

The third meaning of a Christian college is that a group of faculty, administrative officers, students and employees, living together as a community might so order their common life as to constitute both a sample and a training ground of Christian society. Religion would here be a pervasive core of campus life, determining budgetary policies, methods of teaching, rules of social living, personal relations of students with faculty and other employees of the college, responsibilities of students and faculty in off-campus contacts, study habits, worship, selection of campus activities, or leadership in student organizations.

It is to this sort of Christian college that we might well look for a new day in Christian education and in national life. We must not overestimate the influence of higher education in a democracy; but we may well recall that men's chief question today about Christian ideals is, "Does not the fact that Christians do not practice them show that they are impracticable in our world?" The only answer to that question is a living demonstration of Christian life lived in democratic community. I know what you are saying. You are saying: "This is a fine ideal but it's up in the clouds. The professor is speaking from an armchair in an ivory tower to presidents who ride in Pullman club cars and face hard-headed businessmen at trustees' meetings across tables covered with financial figures. His nose is in a book, and he doesn't know students with their fraternity rivalries, their collegiate flivvers, and their lusty adolescence. What is worse: he doesn't even know his colleagues with their academic inertia, their petty jealousies and their cynicism about reform in higher education."

The criticism is gratuitous. I travel too much in the colleges to suffer academic myopia. I have served on too many academic committees to overestimate my colleagues on the faculties. I have counseled



too many students, real and supposed, to overlook the limitations of youth—or its possibilities. But this I also know: that unless our Christian colleges can make a better case for their claim to the title, their days are numbered. The big universities can give better intellectual discipline, despite their numbers, if it is just a training of the mind that you want. But the smaller college has a definite function in the cultivation of moral and religious attitudes, since these are developed within a community life such as the great university does not as an institution enjoy.

At the same time the country is looking wistfully and expectantly these days for some steady light to guide its living and thinking. Familiar shibboleths are fading out. Self-confidence is waning. Temporizing cannot cope with the seriousness of the revolution taking place in our national life both in foreign and in domestic relations. More radical steps are required; and Christianity, without becoming a member of this or that radical political movement, must dig to the roots of national life to be effective today. This means securing some control of the fundamental attitudes and faiths of men.

It is this that a Christian college can do, if it will, through the radical and wholehearted Christianizing of its own internal life. Let it frankly and proudly declare that it intends to emphasize spiritual values in alliance with rigorous pursuit of truth. By this it will mean not a pious addendum to a good stiff intellectual discipline; but a thoroughgoing program of scientific, artistic, literary and philosophic training which includes a central concern for Christian values as the basis of its morale and the aim of its disciplined learning.

This is not to say that there is any such thing as a Christian chemistry or mathematics; but that nothing less than painstaking and ascetic regard for facts can ever be the sound basis for Christian living in society. Accurate description is a value in the Christian way of life—a point for college publicity officers to remember! Canons of literary taste are not directly Christian, but their relation to effective expression of Christian experience and Christian hopes, as well as to the clarification of the human life in which these hopes are to be realized, is obvious. But it is not in asking what immediate contributions these arts and sciences are to make to Christian values that the meaning of a Christian college is to be sought; but in grasping the character of a *Christian* community of teachers, students, employees and administrators.



Then the policies of the college are to be decided in terms of proximate goals along the road to what Christians call the Kingdom of God. In less theological language this means that the Christian view of the world and man's life in it yields some conclusions regarding principles that should govern his relations with his fellow men. Pre-eminently it means that men should seek to order their relations by a clear and realistic insight into the life of another person, a determination to see life from that person's viewpoint, and then to help that person to become what is best in his situation. This is the meaning of Christian love; and into it go all the careful researches of the scientists, all the appreciations and sensitiveness of the artistic mind, all the skills and ingenuity of the man of affairs.

With such an admitted emphasis on spiritual values, the college must see its religious task as an integrated whole. Every task on the campus can have religious meaning, and in Christian education this meaning must be made explicit and thus given more effective implementation. The classroom, without prejudicing its specialized concerns—indeed by the very process of doing its specialized job conscientiously and in perspective—makes its contribution to the religious life of the campus. In dormitory relations a thousand little and big incidents occur in which Christian values are involved daily. The very budget on the president's desk is full of value-judgments. Is this new laboratory essential? Can that person be spared? Must we give that activity a larger place in our program and provide more money for it? What is my obligation to the individual whom we must ask to resign because of budgetary limitations? Disciplinary cases in the dean's office are religious occasions (even when they make him profane in his secret remarks!) because human values are at stake and there is a Christian way of handling them.

In such a college the so-called religious program is not another activity in a series; but the attempt to make clear and explicit the values by which the community lives. The administration will provide times and places where the whole community can express its aspirations, deepen its resolves, admit its shortcomings and redirect its consecration. It is a solemn task but a very vital one. Ultimately it is inseparable from the counseling program of the college; for how shall a student be "adjusted" except in terms of some life aims and basic values embraced by the community? The curriculum will devote courses on religion to the critical

study and constructive formulation of explicit Christian thinking as found in the Bible and in the best thought of the Christian movement, when seen in relation to other religious traditions and to the intellectual problems of our time. Voluntary agencies like the Christian Associations will then locate in student-experience areas whose religious import needs examination, and after preliminary exploratory discussion refer to the department of Bible or religion those problems requiring consecutive and intensive study. Thus the curriculum would be kept closer to actual religious needs of students without sacrificing rigor of intellectual discipline. At the same time, the organization of student action, so as to put into practice some of the intellectual conclusions reached in curricular studies, might well be a function of the voluntary agencies. Thus the various aspects of college training would be inseparable from each other: parts of a united approach to Christian living and thinking.

Throughout the college life the arteries of Christian thought and concern would be throbbing near enough to be felt on the surface of campus activity. Decisions would be made in terms of Christian attitudes which would be the accepted attitudes of the whole college in its community life. Intellectual Christian leadership would then come into its own. The Christian college would be a training ground for social leadership where the difficult techniques of adjustment would be learned, and the art of reaching Christian decisions in social life would be acquired; while, because of the favored conditions of college life, opportunity would be afforded to study at greater leisure the meaning of an ordered society governed by Christian ideals, reviewed with the best intellectual tools, and embodying the finest insights of scientific knowledge and method.

We are entering a period in American culture where the leading strings of a declining European background must be cut loose, and an indigenous American culture developed from the rich heritage which Europe in a happier day bequeathed to us. Whether this American culture of the future shall be Christian or not becomes a question of the greatest seriousness. It is by no means certain that America will be a Christian country. That is for the churches to say, if they will accept the challenge. One of the greatest assets which they possess for this great task is the church colleges. If the church colleges become more truly Christian and more competently intellectual they can furnish the leadership required for this high calling.

## Cast Down But Not Destroyed

JOHN SUTHERLAND BONNELL

**O**N SUNDAY morning, May 18th, I preached to a crowded congregation in Wellington Church, Glasgow. For me it was a deeply moving experience. The people listened to my words with friendly, eager attention in an atmosphere charged with emotion.

Wellington is one of the historic congregations of the Church of Scotland. It is well known throughout the English-speaking world. Visitors invariably remember its unusual type of architecture in the fashion of a Greek Temple, with stately pillars across its front entrance at the summit of a series of broad stone steps. Wellington is situated beside the University of Glasgow, and its ministry has always been characterized by its intellectual and cultural, as well as spiritual appeal. Rev. E. D. Jarvis, the present minister, maintains fully the high traditions of his church.

An unusual feature of the services at Wellington is that no collection is ever taken up in the church. Pillar collection receptacles stand outside the front entrance in the vestibule, and the worshiper may deposit his offering on entering the church or leaving it. The minister told me that this mode of taking up an offering is fully as effective as that employed in most churches, and of course it is far less obtrusive.

The service opened on a triumphant note of praise. Coming from the United States one is especially impressed by the heartiness and volume of congregational singing in Scotland.

There is abundant evidence that the church people of Britain are drawing upon deep and abiding spiritual resources, which give to them quietness and confidence in the hour of trial and enable them, in the face of terrible adversity, to maintain the dignity of an unbroken spirit.

We have heard much at times of the staid, unemotional Scottish people but, as I read to the morning congregation at Wellington Church messages from the church bodies in the United States which I officially represented—messages of good will, of admiration, of sincere affection and love, I doubt if there was a dry eye in the whole congregation. One of the messages I carried to the British churches was from a large and

representative group of ministers of the Metropolitan area of New York. Their spokesman was the Rev. Dr. Joseph R. Sizoo of the Collegiate Church of Saint Nicholas, Fifth Avenue.

"When you arrive on the other side," he said, "tell the British people for us that we do not know what this war is doing to them, but the way they are standing up uncomplainingly with an unfaltering faith in an unfailing God has shamed us out of our petty complaints and awakened in us a new steadfastness and loyalty to the purposes of God.

"Tell them for us that everything we have and all that our hands can make is theirs, and that our hearts belong to them too. We do not know what the issues of tomorrow will be for us, but if war must come we will do our fighting and dying on the same side. Say to them that we believe, too, that in the economy of God, not Corsica but Galilee speaks the last word and that God's day always ends in dawn."

While in Scotland I preached at both services at Wellington Church, Glasgow, and on the following Sunday in Saint George's Church, Edinburgh, in the morning, and in Saint Cuthbert's Church at night. Saint Cuthbert's is probably the oldest church in Edinburgh and is situated almost at the base of the great rock upon which Edinburgh Castle is founded. In the churchyard I came upon a gravestone erected to the memory of an American citizen. The inscription is so quaint that I copied it down and reproduce it here:

IN MEMORY OF  
RUFUS WOODWARD

Born at Corringford, Connecticut 16th July, 1793.  
Graduate Yale 1816. Visited Europe to pursue his  
studies and restore his health 1823. Died Edinburgh  
24 Nov. 1823. His friends here who cheered his last  
hours and committed his remains to this grave knew  
and recognized him as an amiable American stranger.

Each congregation I addressed in Britain, whether in Scotland or in England, gave me a warm-hearted welcome. I stressed the desire of American churches to keep open between us and them the channels of Christian fellowship, especially in a day when treachery and violence are filling the world with strife. After one of the meetings, a young Scottish woman came up to me and said:

"It is very sporting of you Americans to come over here to help us, and especially to tell us that we are in your thoughts and prayers. It makes us love America all the more. And mind you," she added, "it isn't what you say that counts so much as the fact that you are here."

That young woman spoke the mind of thousands of British people. It is cheap and easy for American church bodies to send cables and letters telling the British people how much we admire their courage and their faith; but only the actual presence in their midst of a representative of the American churches, who shares their perils with them, can express that message in an adequate and convincing way. It is highly desirable that throughout the whole of the war the churches of America will continue to send representatives to Britain with messages of encouragement and cheer, emphasizing our common heritage of faith.

The meeting of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in Edinburgh, which I attended as an official delegate of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A., was a memorable experience. The opening ceremonies were shorn of some of their pageantry because of the war but they were nevertheless impressive.

First to enter the General Assembly Hall and to take their seats on each side of the Moderator's chair were the City Fathers arrayed in scarlet robes with ermine capes and gold chains. Then came the surviving Moderators, who sat in front of the Moderator's rostrum. They were venerable-looking gray-haired men. The youngest of them appeared to be at least sixty-five and the oldest was over ninety. Last of all came the Moderator, the Rev. Dr. J. R. Forgan of Ayr, an impressive figure in his official dress with knee breeches and silver buckles, and lace on his shirt bosom and cuffs. While the congregation remained standing, the Moderator took his place on the platform and solemnly bowed first to the right-hand side, then to the front, then to the left, and each of these sections of the assembled congregation bowed to him in turn. Then, in the impressive ritual of the Church of Scotland, he declared the General Assembly formally opened. The Assembly then united in singing, without accompaniment either by choir or organ and led only by a precentor, that soul-stirring Psalm:

"All people that on earth do dwell,  
Sing to the Lord with cheerful voice."

The congregation of a thousand ministers and elders sang as only Scotsmen can sing the Psalms. As the hymn of praise was lifted up, I found my eyes growing misty for I felt that four hundred years of Scottish Church history was passing before us—long hard battles for spiritual freedom fought amid the mountains and moss hags of Scotland

and uncompromising adherence to those truths by which men live. Scotsmen appreciate the value of their religious freedom because they know that it was purchased for them by their fathers at a great price.

It is significant that it was not until after the General Assembly had been officially opened that the King's representative, the Lord High Commissioner Sir Ian Calhoun, with his retinue, came into the Assembly Hall and took his place on a thronelike seat high up on a balcony behind the Moderator. He read to the Assembly a message from the King, signed and sealed at the Court of Saint James, and a little later in the proceedings the Moderator, on behalf of the General Assembly, read a loyal address to His Majesty.

We were constantly reminded that the Church of Scotland is the only established church of that land and there takes precedence over all others. If the Archbishop of Canterbury should happen at any time to visit Edinburgh or any other part of Scotland, in any State procession he must take second place to the Moderator of the Church of Scotland.

One of the interested listeners to the proceedings on the opening day was Miss Mary Churchill, daughter of the Prime Minister. She was seated not far from the Lord High Commissioner. Many persons present commented on her likeness to her famous father.

Two facts in connection with the Lord High Commissioner's place in the General Assembly should be noted: First, that he is not admitted to the floor of the Assembly where business is transacted, and secondly, he does not enter the Assembly until after it is constituted. The Church of Scotland desires that all men shall know that it is a spiritual institution and in no way subject to the dictates of the State.

A well-known Scottish minister told me an incident which illustrates this. It occurred at the time when the Rev. Dr. John White, a venerable figure in Scottish Church history, was Moderator of the Church of Scotland. At that time the Duke of York (the present King George VI) was Lord High Commissioner. A military officer, who was in charge of the Lord High Commissioner's retinue, sent a letter to the Moderator, Dr. John White, specifying that the King's representative would enter the front door of the Assembly and thus proceed to his seat on the Lord High Commissioner's throne. He received a curt reply from the Moderator to the effect that it was not customary for the Lord High Commissioner to enter the General Assembly by the front door; that he would



enter through a side door and reach his appointed place without passing through the Assembly itself. The officer, who was ignorant of the independence and spirit of Scottish churchmen, was highly indignant and informed the Moderator of the Church of Scotland that the Lord High Commissioner would certainly come by way of the front door. The controversy continued within a few hours of the opening of the Assembly, and, finally, a peremptory note was sent to the army officer by Doctor White, informing him that the Lord High Commissioner would enter the doorway appointed for him or he need not come at all.

The Duke of York, a long-time friend of Doctor White, learning of the controversy, was much amused at the insistence of the army officer and sent word to the Moderator that he would be very pleased to enter in the way appointed by the Church of Scotland. And so it came to pass, and the venerable General Assembly of the Church of Scotland once again vindicated its freedom from State interference.

The election of the new Moderator, Dr. J. Hutchinson Cockburn, had been completed some time before the meeting of the General Assembly. He was chosen not by the commissioners to the Assembly in open meeting after the manner of American church courts, but by the Moderator's Council composed of surviving moderators. It is difficult to imagine American ministers agreeing to this procedure. It would be objected to at once as undemocratic.

During the service of installation, the retiring Moderator, Doctor Forgan, said he was happy to welcome into office a successor that he could "look up to"—not only mentally and spiritually, but physically as well. Doctor Cockburn stands 6 feet 5 inches in height and weighs well over two hundred pounds. He presided over the Assembly with impartiality and untiring patience, and his closing address revealed his rich resources of mind and heart.

I shall always feel that the night of Wednesday, May 21st, when I addressed the General Assembly, was one of the great experiences of my life. The rather overwhelming reception given to me by the Assembly I accepted not as a personal tribute, but as a testimony of appreciation to the American churches and especially to the Presbyterian Church U. S. A., which had sent me as official delegate to demonstrate the solidarity of Christian peoples on both sides of the Atlantic.

There was no mistaking the Assembly's appreciation of the assistance

given by America to Britain and her Allies or its enthusiasm for President Roosevelt. Early in my address I began a quotation from one of the speeches of the President, in which he declared that democracy and international good faith had their roots in religion. I was able only to say: "In an address delivered more than two years ago President Roosevelt . . ." when the remainder of the sentence was drowned out in tumultuous cheers and applause which lasted for almost a minute.

The Assembly did not sidestep the war issue. It adopted a profound declaration entitled, "The Interpretation of the Will of God in the Present Crisis." It affirms that no nation, including Britain, is wholly guiltless of the circumstances out of which the war arose; but unhesitatingly declares that in Germany "demoniac forces of evil have captured the soul of the people." There was no mistaking the fact that the Scottish Churches are solidly united behind the national effort.

I found almost no trace of absolute pacifism among the ministers and church leaders of Britain. Thousands of them who had previously affirmed their adherence to pacifism have renounced their former stand after the intentions of Hitler and his minions in the Nazi movement had become clear. Some of these, like Dr. Leslie D. Weatherhead of the City Temple, London, and Dr. Maude Royden, have set forth in detail the reasons for their change of viewpoint. Several ministers in Britain remarked to me that they wondered what Dick Sheppard of Saint Martin's-in-the-Field would do if he were living now. It will be remembered that he was closely associated with Dr. Maude Royden in pacifist movements. The general consensus seems to be that he too would have reversed his previous conclusions.

Among the well-known laymen who have publicly recanted on this subject is Mr. J. E. M. Joad, the English rationalist and man of letters. The manner in which the advent of Hitler has changed the total picture can best be seen by quoting a sentence from the writings of Mr. Joad penned during the days when he was advocating pacifism and total disarmament: "If Great Britain would totally disarm now, she would be as safe as Denmark."

A minister of the Church of Scotland, who had been jailed three times during the last war because of his pacifism, is today actively engaged in supporting the war effort. When he was asked for an explanation of this complete reversal he replied:

"For ten years I have lived in Europe with my headquarters at Vienna. I worked for the relief of refugees. Having seen at close hand what the brutal Nazis have been doing to the people of Europe, I would gladly give my life to deliver the world from their domination."

The churches of Britain seem to have suffered out of all proportion to other buildings. More than one thousand of them have been destroyed or very seriously damaged, and many thousands have been damaged to a less serious degree. The destruction of church properties in Scotland has not been anything as great as the losses suffered in England, but they have been serious enough, as the following figures from the Church of Scotland register will show: fifteen churches, halls and manses had been destroyed—fifty-two seriously damaged and one hundred forty-two less seriously damaged—a total of two hundred nine parish buildings bombed.

If the losses of all religious bodies in Scotland were taken into account the figure would be much larger. So extensive has been the damage to churches in air raids that it would almost seem as though they had been singled out as targets. For instance, in one night's raid on Belfast, the German Air Force completely destroyed six churches and seriously damaged fourteen more. Yet everywhere the churches carry on and their people carry on.

The destruction of the churches has brought an ever-increasing spirit of co-operation among the various religious bodies. For instance, when the City Temple was left a heap of smouldering ruins, the Anglican congregation of Saint Sepulchre turned its church over to their people and they have worshiped there, Sunday by Sunday. Another instance of their co-operation occurred when Our Lady of Victories, a Roman Catholic Church, was destroyed by bombing in London. A near-by Anglican Church gave their Catholic neighbors 250 chairs so that they might be able to meet in a hall. A Protestant gave them an organ. The building in which they are now meeting used to be rented at £7,000 a year. The rent asked of the homeless Roman Catholic congregation has been reduced to one shilling a year. The owner of the building is a Jew.

This is typical of what is happening all over Britain. Anglicans, Roman Catholics, and Free churchmen come to the assistance of each other and give their churches and parish buildings without charge for the use of homeless congregations.

Scores of ministers and priests may be seen during every air raid

engaged in protecting their church buildings, in rendering first-aid to the wounded, and giving consolation to the dying. A new respect for the churches is being manifested, even on the part of those who had little use for their ministries during days of peace. There are no perils that the people of Britain are facing today which are not willingly shared by the clergy.

On my first visit to London, I had crossed Hyde Park and was walking toward Westminster Abbey when I noticed a large sign on an iron fence. I had not previously noticed that the fence surrounded the ruins of a church. This is how the notice read:

Christ Church, Westminster, is destroyed by enemy action, but come and pray in the vestry chapel under the tower. Daily Communion at 8:30 A. M. Daily Intercession at noon.

Turning aside, I made my way to the tower, which was all that was left of this beautiful and historic church. I glanced through the barricaded door that led from the tower to the main body of the church. Only a fragment of the side walls still remain. One could see bits of charred frame where valuable paintings had been on the walls. The altar rail was twisted and blackened, and the floor of the church was piled high in places with the ashes of the pews, the pulpit, the choir stalls and other church furnishings.

The tower, seating some eighteen people, had been transformed into a chapel with a small, white altar against the wall. I found myself all alone in this chapel, and, as a representative of American Christian churches, I knelt there and asked God's blessing upon the brave Christian people of Britain who are battling so courageously against almost overwhelming odds. I prayed that their faith might not fail in the day of trial, and that from the anguish and heartbreak of the present there might arise a new and better world.

Typical of the work that is being carried on by British churches is the ministry of an historic Methodist church in London. The church is fortunate in the possession of several deep basements, and the lowest of all is used as a permanent air-raid shelter. Several hundred people sleep nightly in this shelter, and at the time of the worst *blitz* over a thousand persons were accommodated there. Many of the people who can be seen there night after night have never slept in any other place

than that church basement for almost a year. They have no place to go for they have been bombed out of their homes and have lost all their possessions.

Government regulations prohibit these people from occupying the shelter during daylight hours unless the alert has sounded. Oftentimes, the women and children have no other accommodation, and during the bleak winter days they could be seen clustered around the entrance to the air-raid shelter. The minister said he believed these poor homeless people were actually glad when the siren would sound for a daylight raid because they were then permitted to go down into the basement which was their only home.

One night while I was talking to the people in this air-raid shelter, I met a young R. A. F. officer. He explained that he was on leave. Afterward, I said to the minister in charge:

"What is that R. A. F. officer doing down in this air-raid shelter?"

The minister replied:

"Did you notice those two iron beds one above the other—the ones nearest the door? Well, that boy's father and mother sleep in those beds. They invested their life savings in a house which was blown to bits by German bombs. This shelter is now their only home. So when their son is on leave he comes to spend his nights with his mother and father and we make him a 'shake-down' near their beds."

The air-raid shelter is divided into three or four large dormitories, in each of which are some fifty or sixty two-tier beds. One person is allocated to each bed. The people in the shelter live a kind of communal life and there is little privacy. Consequently, none of them completely undresses before going to bed. For the last ten months they have all slept with part of their daytime clothing on. Mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters, neighbors and friends, all sleep in a common room. A young minister who assists the senior minister of the church, sleeps every night in a room with thirty or forty people. He said to me that the greater part of all the talk regarding "shelter immorality" was pure sensationalism. There always was the occasional flirtation among young people in their early teens but nothing more serious than this.

None of these people who live in the shelter there are members of that particular church and, yet, the minister and his wife have spent more than ten months living among them. They do not sleep in one

of the dormitories but in a separate room on a higher floor. As I was talking with the minister in this bedroom, I noticed light coming through a grating. By way of explanation he said:

"My wife and I sleep here. That grating opens right out on the street. This room has been condemned as an air-raid shelter and the people use the deeper basement, but it is very convenient for us and we have been sleeping here now for some ten months and so far we have escaped injury."

I asked the minister if he were able occasionally to get away for a brief rest. He replied,

"When the heavy *blitz* was on last fall so many injured people were brought to us that my wife and I had no opportunity even to take off our clothes at night, except for an occasional bath, from September to Christmas."

The members of the congregation assist Mr. and Mrs. Sangster in the large canteen, which supplies milk for children, tea and coffee for adults, and an abundance of rolls and sandwiches at cost prices.

It wrung my heart to see the little children in the shelter. I met two little toddlers—one, two and a half years and the other three and a half—walking hand in hand between a line of beds in the basement at 11 o'clock at night. They proudly exhibited two little baskets which had been given to them as a present that evening. It is a distressing fact that little children like these in the shelters are awake four and five hours after they should be sound asleep in bed. Nothing can be done about it, however, as it is impossible to get them to go to sleep while the lights are on and conversation goes on all around them.

Each night the minister gathers the people in the shelter for brief evening prayers. They sing a hymn and he reads a short passage of Scripture and then offers a closing prayer. He introduced me to the people at one of these evening meetings and asked me to speak to them.

"I want you to tell your friends back in the United States," he said, "that you visited us here and that you found no pessimism or defeatism, even though practically everyone before you has lost everything he owned in the world. I have lived with these people," he continued, "for more than nine months, and I have never heard one word of self-pity or discouragement from any one of them."

In the course of my brief address, I happened to refer to Mr.



Willkie and the fact that we lived in the same apartment house in New York. Immediately the people broke into thunderous applause. I turned to the minister and asked him why they were so enthusiastic about Mr. Willkie, and he said:

"He visited this shelter. He came to us during the gloomiest part of the winter—the long, black nights when enemy planes were overhead for ten hours without a letup. I am sure that nobody in the United States can ever realize how much we were cheered and encouraged by his presence."

As we were leaving the shelter, I said to the minister:

"Who is the man who waited around to talk with me after I had shaken hands with all the people?"

"Oh!" he said, "that is a very interesting fellow. His home was blown up and he came to this shelter. He was a Communist and bitter against the Church and religion. He was especially suspicious of me for some weeks. Then, one night we had a terrible *blitz* and hundreds of people were carried down to our first-aid station here. I think that he gained a different idea of the Church and its ministry after he had seen me at work for some hours dressing the wounds of the injured people."

"One night we had an urgent S.O.S. call from several other shelters. I had oversight of them too and had somehow to get to them at once. I needed a man to drive me. Knowing that this man had a taxi, I called on him, and he drove me to shelters in different parts of London while bombs rained down all around us."

"He wouldn't take a cent of pay for doing it either, saying, 'If you are going to risk your life for these people, the least I can do is to use my taxi wherever it is needed.'"

"By morning, that man had lost both his Atheism and Communism. Now he is one of our best helpers in this shelter."

The churches of Britain have suddenly awakened to the discovery that their greatest opportunity may lie in ministering to those who have remained outside their own four walls. They have learned also that the destruction of a church edifice may actually result in the quickening of the spiritual life of a parish and the enlargement of its spiritual vision.

In Britain an emancipated Christianity is on the march.

## The Christian Doctrine of Vocation

GEORGE M. GIBSON

WHEN William Carey answered his questioner, "My life-work is serving the Lord; I cobble shoes for a living," it was to sum up in a sentence the effect of centuries' teaching on the bearing of the Christian profession upon the tasks of life.

We need not here try to trace the process by which shoe-cobbling got the better of serving the Lord. But we are beginning to realize that contemporary civilization, having failed at so many points, has failed nowhere so grievously as in its repudiation of the Christian doctrine of vocation. Even the Middle Ages forecast that repudiation, when the very effort to specialize in sanctity worked in practice toward secularization. The Renaissance completed the drift toward humanization, elevating the choices of men above the assignments of God. The anti-churchly emphasis of the new men threw them on their own as their aroused curiosity was directed toward this-worldly tasks in a this-worldly spirit. Protestantism on the whole proved unable to check, and in some expressions actually furthered the tendency of the Industrial Revolution toward complete *laissez faire*, too often lending the sanction of religion to the declaration of independence of lifework from all normal considerations. The high specialization of science denying wholeness, the arrogant reliance upon human experience, and the many variations of a philosophy of impersonal determinism were other factors in modernity making for neglect of the religious implications in the daily duty, and ultimately resulting in the breakdown of civilization in depressions and wars.

This process may be traced from Carey to the typical modern businessman who retired to become an amateur farmer. As he hoed his weeds one evening in his garden a pious neighbor called to him over the fence, "That is a beautiful spot that you and God have made." His answer summed up in a sentence the tendency of modern times to secularize the whole of life. Said he, "You should have seen this little spot when God had it all to Himself."

But things have happened fast these two decades as though to

introduce a new humility into the vaunted pride of man. Confronted now with the disintegration of a whole era, modern man brings forward some beginning evidences that his preoccupation with the problem of the world has brought him at last to the problem of self. Impersonal trends and forces will not explain his decline and fall; such explanation must be sought and found in the soul. The energies of self-interest promise nothing but compounded destruction for the social whole and meaninglessness for the individual person. To Rollo May's fine phrase, "There is something in the universe that wants you," may be added, "and that something is not thyself."

Even in the present perverted doctrines of "leadership," with their corollary emphasis upon "commitment," is an implied concession to the personal spiritual character of life as opposed to the impersonal material views that dominated modernity. Though there is a vast difference between leading folk and plundering them, and though blind commitment to a plundering leader is poles apart from the Christian's conscious surrender to Christ, nevertheless, the confession is implied. To meet the challenge of these new state forms, Christianity is prompted to revive its central teaching of the Lordship of Jesus under Whom all Christians receive their assignments in the complex division of labor which is the commonwealth of God.

The effort of many callings to define themselves today as "professions" is perhaps another evidence of the growing revolt against the meaninglessness of life. To the three classic professions of the Middle Ages, the clergy, medicine and the law, have been added all manner of modern "callings," each trying to convince us of its professional character. These varied "professionals," including realtors, morticians, cosmeticians, and countless others, seek dignity by high-sounding names and security through "ethical" codes. Again, there is in this movement a concession to that distinctive feature of professional life which looks to some body of criteria above and beyond simply self-interest and group-interest. It is obvious that mere self-interest is not a sufficient motive for the clergy, but rather, in this high calling, all things must be undertaken as in obedience to the higher law of God. Medicine recognizes this transcendent criterion in that disinterested service, the finest expression of which is in the oath of Hippocrates. The law also looks above self-interest, to pure equity as its guide. Even the least idealistic follower of these vocations never dare

admit aloud that self-interest is his supreme motive. He is committed to something, not himself; and must follow his transcendent criterion though it cost him money and reputation. It is here suggested that in the effort of these trades to win the status of "professions" there is at once a confession of the barrenness of work undertaken in a spirit of self-seeking, and an acceptance of the validity of the higher claim as put by Plato, "Only by way of some divine disclosure coming into life from outside it could men find the way of truth and freedom."

The Christian teaching on this subject is an extension of that theme. Originally the Christian calling was simple and pure. It had to do, not so much with the choice of a vocation, as with the Master's command, "Follow Me." All Christians were called, first, to lead the Christian life. In a sense all were ministers—that is, servants of the cause. This involved, more often than not, the abandonment of life-work. Matthew had to leave his tax-gathering and Peter his fishing-nets. Remaining in the world but not of it these first Christians were henceforth to know no vocation except that of being disciples of their Lord. This abandonment of daily labor did not so much imply a judgment of evil upon the common tasks as an urgency in the larger spiritual work of the coming Kingdom. The immediacy of the Kingdom hope was a strong factor in minimizing ordinary work. The point is that the Christian view of calling, at its earliest expression and for some continuing time, was not a concern for vocational guidance, but a call to be set apart for specific Christian duty. This separateness is reflected in one of the earliest names applied to the community of believers, *ecclesia*.

This call to separateness is a New Testament refrain. Nor was it entirely dependent upon the apocalyptic hope. Indeed, Paul urged his Christians not to lay much store by a speedy return of the Lord, but to address themselves to daily tasks. Thus, in the very heat of the early gospel zeal, a principle of normality in daily life began to develop. Later this was more fully stated in the teaching of the dignity of all labor done in the name of the Lord.

By the time Christianity had become an important religion within the Roman Empire, the matter of vocation was approached in a spirit of caution lest the purity of the Christian call be sullied. While recognizing that Christians not only may, but must work at the daily tasks, care was taken to proscribe such work as was inconsistent with the central

profession. Lifework had to be in keeping with the moral and ethical demands of the faith. A Christian could not be a soldier because soldiering in its very nature was contrary to the mind and spirit of the Master. This profession of ancient and honorable lineage among the pagans had no standing with the Christians until Constantine. To follow it would involve a blasphemy and a desecration, for it would mean, first, offering supreme allegiance to Caesar; and, second, the violent taking of human life. Similarly the Roman Christians were forbidden to be goldsmiths, for goldsmiths were called upon to manufacture idols. They could not be bankers, for that meant putting money out at usury, and all interest was considered usury. Nor could they well serve as merchants, for that involved acceptance of the profit motive. The profession of acting was also under the ban with these Christians, as it was with the Jews before them, in that it meant a distortion of the image God had given man. And secular teaching was forbidden, because teachers were expected to pander to the current intellectual interests and to offer rhetorical plausibilities supporting the prevailing pagan philosophies. Aldous Huxley, noting these proscriptions, thinks that Christianity lost much of its moral power when it ceased limiting vocations and defining approved tasks.

The recognized division of labor in the early Christian enterprise centered upon service of the Christ. Some were prophets, some teachers, some ministers, some treasurers, but each took his place of consecrated assignment in the total order whose head was Christ. Those laboring at the lay tasks were to do such things only as were consistent with the demands of justice, generosity and humility. Glaring contradictions between the simple ethical absolutes and the actual practices of worldly occupations, were not tolerated.

In the later historic development of the doctrine two main strains are found: first, the emphasis upon the divine constraint; and, second, upon the human response. While these are usually in combination they are seldom in balance, and one or the other is stressed in each particular putting of the teaching.

The monk Cassion who, on the southern coast of Gaul in the fifth century, formed the monastic movement, conceived of Christian calling in the first emphasis. His "call of God" came as a rigorous demand upon the heart that could do no other. This inescapable assignment to duty made itself known in three ways: First, there was direct inspiration,

often audible in its clarity. It was so unmistakable that man would contend against it only to his everlasting damnation or would accept it to the glory of God. Next came the shining example of another whose contagious devotion caught one up in a commitment seemingly involuntary. And, third, the call was felt in the exigencies of life, as times of general crisis commanded the soul to make answer.

In all these ways personal uncertainties were resolved in what seemed a destiny, a call from a source beyond the self. Such devotees were relieved of the painful doubts that precede significant decisions, for their decisions were taken for them. They carried with them a peace of mind even in strenuous action, a peace derived from their surrender to the Great Decision from which all lesser decisions flow. For such the world may change, but they do not change. Only the tomb will seal their work, and the eternal will call it good.

This emphasis marked the monastic movement in its entirety, making, at its best, for purity of devotion, and, in its excess, leaving practical life to secular claims. It is seen at its purest in Saint Francis, with his literal acceptance of the vocation of poverty, chastity and obedience. The Little Brothers were without professional or family responsibilities. But something of the later Protestant view is found in the formation of the humble saint's Second and Third Orders, the Second for women seeking to serve the Lord while yet serving at their housekeeping; and the Third for laymen wishing to continue their family and work responsibilities while attempting to work out the Christian way in terms of everyday life. It was with extreme reluctance that Francis finally yielded to these importunings, and he never recovered his disappointment at what struck him as essentially a compromise of the pure principles of Christ.

This whole view of vocation may be said to have reached its full statement in the comprehensive scheme of Saint Thomas Aquinas, with its orders and ranks under a hierarchical conception of the Christian world society. The medieval idea is considered by Jacques Maritain<sup>1</sup> as being spiritually aristocratic rather than democratic. It is not equalitarian. There were classes each having its function in a well ordered society. The evil of the situation was not in its hierarchical conception. As long as there was retained a proper balance between the clergy, the noblesse and the third estate, the spiritual unity of medieval society was unimpaired.

<sup>1</sup> *True Humanism*. Ch. III, p. 106.



The situation, says Maritain, became tragic when there became in fact only two divisions, the dominated and the dominant, the exploited and the exploiters. The saintly ideal, by an exclusive stress upon withdrawal from life, had left life to the processes of secularization and forecast the spiritual disintegration of medieval culture.

The second main emphasis, largely identified with Protestantism, was upon man's response to the divine initiative, with stress upon freedom of choice in the selection of vocation. This was an outgrowth of the central Protestant doctrine of the "priesthood of all believers," with its anti-authoritarianism and its consequent equalitarianism. Here was laid a religious basis for a democratically conceived society in which hierarchies both of Church and State were to be leveled. Then began the spirit of the essential equality of all men before God, later to be expressed in Browning's song of Pippa:

All service ranks the same with God—  
With God whose puppets, best and worst,  
Are we; there is no last nor first.

Yet Martin Luther, who laid the basis for the Protestant spiritual democracy, was hardly a modern Protestant in regard to his doctrine of vocation, but rather held to the monastic view. Though decidedly energetic in reform, his mood touching life-work is passive rather than active. The rôle of man, he felt, was to obey the assignment of the Authority whose work is the commissioning of humanity into the proper division of labor required by an ordered moral society.

Oddly enough, the stress upon freedom of human choice was the contribution of that theologian who, more than all others, is known for his high sense of the sovereignty of God, John Calvin. With him the typical Protestant note is struck. There was a call of God, to be sure, but man was made free to respond or to refuse to respond to the call. And, even in giving his assent, he was still free to exercise his powers of judgment actively. He was to weigh factors, analyze possibilities, appraise consequences, and come to responsible decisions in the light of his experience. Not only were all his personal powers involved in the making of a right decision, but in following through the life-work on which he settled. This was man as free agent saying yes to the call of the Divine.

The extension of the principle of vocation to include the more prosaic

lay labors was accepted by Protestantism. The world's work was to go forward on the basis of a strong belief in the dignity of all labor in a commonwealth of essential equality. In Horace Bushnell's *Every Man's Life a Plan of God* is felt the vocational connotation with Protestant meaning. The "plan of God" for the life of every man was not only the plan of salvation, but of practical work in the commonplace duties. F. B. Barry recalls that note in a recent comment that "God is concerned with all vocations."

The present problem is set in the dialectical outcome of that historic stress. Whereas the Middle Ages secularized life through preoccupation with the saintly ideal, Protestantism, seeking to spiritualize life by "making common things clean," worked toward the end of reserving religion mainly as a sanction for current commercial practices. Where all things are regarded as sacred, and nothing especially so, the danger is that all things become secular. Then are men thrown back upon the natural urges of self-interest for their motivations, making their religious professions subservient to their practical tasks, while trying to relieve the baldness of exploitation by speaking of "enlightened self-interest." But self-interest is never enlightened. When selfish men grow more intelligent they do not thereby grow more virtuous, but only more clever in their exploitations. The product of this self-interest, though "enlightened" with all the philosophy of the Industrial Revolution and sanctioned by a secularized Protestantism, is finally the undedicated workman in an unconsecrated society.

In the contemporary revival of this doctrine of vocation Professor Calhoun is the most extensive spokesman thus far. In his *God and the Common Life* he builds upon this typical Protestant conception, seeking to extend it to the anarchic riot now prevailing in our unconsecrated callings. "Adoration of God," he writes, "should be integral to and not sundered from everyday life." He offers three lines for development: first, "systematic and persistent doing of useful work"; second, "the individual's own constituent powers"; and, third, "a willing, contributive share in the world's work." It is seen at a glance that these lines lead outward from the doctrine of vocation into many other disciplines of modern thought. "Systematic and persistent doing of useful work" is something calling for such a general social reconstruction as will make such work

possible for the masses, no less than for a spirit of consecration in the individual. The tragedy of these times is not so much in the unwillingness of men to work at useful tasks as in the social prohibitions that frustrate the millions with periodical unemployment. The appreciation of "the individual's own constituent powers" welcomes the total insight of the recently developed psychology of vocational guidance. And "a willing, contributive share in the world's work" looks not only to the socialization of the individual, but to the creation of a world commonwealth which will give vaster meaning to the daily toil.

It has been seen that either major emphasis, the Medieval or the Protestant, may produce its bad effects upon life. One way leads to the excesses of asceticism making for warped personality in the individual while relegating the practical works to secular men. The other way leads through self-sufficient activism toward that self-interest which proves destructive, not only of the finer capacities of the individual, but of the very conception of commonwealth. The revived doctrine would do well to keep both these strains in balance.

Of first importance in the restated doctrine is a fresh appreciation of the "call to preach." As theology, in the Middle Ages, was "Queen of sciences," so the ministry is "king of callings"; royal not in worldly pomp and authority, but in keeping with the teaching of the Master that the greatest among them is the servant of all. The Christian ministry is looked to for guidance on our central problem, and its meeting that responsibility entails first a new grasp of its own commission. This is the starting-point in the building of what Middleton Murry calls "the compassionate community" which all men seek today by many means, mostly mistaken, and which is to be found nowhere outside the concept of Church. The minister, with a new sense of commitment to his own task, must lead today in the work of ameliorating suffering, mediating justice, spreading mercy, and bringing a sense of sanctity to the common labors of life. He must seek at the same time that independence from secular life which was monastic separateness at its best, and that invasion of life with the spirit of service which was Protestantism's highest contribution. Both paths present hazards if the ways be followed exclusively, but in their wise balance will be found the clue to the present riddle.

## The Quarter's Fiction

JOHN C. SCHROEDER

**S**URELY nothing better could happen to this bitter world than to have it meet a saint. When men can see nothing except their own evil, it can only do them good to meet a good man. It is hard to be anything but cynical about any human pretension to goodness. This is the reason why it is so startling to find an author concerned to write a novel about a contemporary saint. Undoubtedly *The Keys of the Kingdom* is the book of the year in the field of religious fiction. Everyone will be reading it; everyone ought to be reading it. They will find a serene reassurance in the person of Father Francis Chisholm who matches all the evil of his world with a humble and victorious faith.

Francis was brought up in Scotland, the son of a respected head watcher of a fishing station and a mother who was a "well-doing woman." Alex Chisholm was a Roman Catholic; his wife the daughter of a lay evangelist. Religious intolerance leads to the tragic death of these two fine people and the orphan boy finds himself the victim of all the venomous rapacity of the bigoted Glennie household, from which he is fortunately rescued through the good offices of the atheist Doctor Tulloch. "Aunt" Polly Bannon and her cheerful tavern-keeping husband give the boy a happy home where he grows up amidst the friendliness and piety of these simple people.

He goes to Holywell, a Catholic college in northern Scotland. There he comes to know the various types of ecclesiastics who teach in the institution and learns to watch with mingled distrust and admiration the quick success of a boyhood friend, Anselm Mealey. Mealey is a born leader, who knows enough never to offend an ecclesiastical superior. Even as a young man Francis's devotion to God was reserved, Anselm's was always on parade.

While he is at college, Nora, whom he has loved, is forced into a hideous marriage from which she is able to escape only through suicide. His world again shattered by tragedy, his misery forces him to a decision. "First his parents and now Nora. He could no longer ignore

these testaments from above. . . . He would give himself entirely to God."

At the seminary in San Morales his life is unconventional and he has difficulty accepting the rigid pattern of accepted orthodoxy. It was inevitable that he would never become a successful curate. He loved people too much and was too ready to sacrifice the institution to their needs. Finally he displeases his dean when his doubts lead him to question the authenticity of a healing miracle in the parish (it is too bad that the author has to save his own orthodoxy here by compensating with another miracle which is not questioned) and is saved only by the wisdom of his bishop who alone of his superiors recognizes the young curate's devotion to Christ. The bishop says to him as he orders him to China: "To me . . . you are not a failure but a howling success. You've got inquisitiveness and tenderness. You're sensible of the distinction between thinking and doubting. You're not one of the ecclesiastical milliners who must have everything stitched up in neat little packets—convenient for handing out. And quite the nicest thing about you, my dear boy, is this—you haven't got that bumptious security which springs from dogma rather than faith. Of course, unless we do something about it, you're going to get hurt."

The parish in China was supposed to contain four hundred souls but when he gets there he finds that all are "rice Christians." He starts building slowly and only on his faith in a good God. He was to meet not only the resistance of the Chinese but also that of the Sister Superior who is there to help him. She is a German woman of noble family who scorns his humble origin and only after a long time comes to recognize his unqualified devotion to Christ. Francis works through a terrible plague at the side of the young Doctor Tulloch, an atheist like his father. He does not get converts enough to satisfy Anselm Mealey now rising fast on the heirarchical ladder. Mealey is sincere, efficient, unctious but incapable of recognizing goodness when he beholds it. Nevertheless Francis has his rewards. Mr. Chia, a Chinese gentleman, at long last comes to the mission. It has taken him many years to discover that "the goodness of a religion is best judged by the goodness of its adherents." Francis's best friend in China is the doctor of the near-by Methodist mission and the climax of the book is reached when the priest and the doctor and his wife fall into the hands of bandits.

The book will do great good in a world that needs this kind of proclamation badly. Francis is a Roman Catholic with Protestant virtues since his creed is "I promise faithfully to oppose all that is stupid and bigoted and cruel. Toleration is the highest virtue. Humility comes next." He shocks his superiors when he says, "Christ was the perfect man but Confucius had a better sense of humor." Perhaps this combination of virtues is the true mark of the saint. But it is at this point that the book is not entirely convincing to me. It is not deep enough to be a great story. It lacks the power of enduring fiction. It will be and it ought to be a best seller. Doctor Cronin is a fine craftsman and has sought to do the exceedingly difficult thing of meeting the despair of the times. Perhaps we have no right to expect that any man can do it.

In *The Transposed Heads*, Thomas Mann takes an old Indian fable in hand and through the genius of his incomparable style transforms a fantastic tale into a philosophical allegory. There are three characters: Shidraman, Nanda and Sita. Shidraman is a Brahmin, sensitive to the point of unearthliness, meditative, soft and gentle. His friend Nanda has a dull mind and a robust body, a gay simple son of the people. Sita, his wife, is beautiful. She loves Shidraman but her eyes forever wander to behold the body of Nanda. On a journey they come to the temple of Kali, the terrible dark goddess who is the giver of life and death, of freedom and bondage. Shidraman, meditating upon his failure, cuts off his head in her presence. Nanda, discovering what his friend has done, follows his example. Sita, finding this horror, helpless as only beauty can be helpless in the face of tragedy, is in despair until Kali offers her the chance to replace the heads. In her haste and confusion Sita puts them on the wrong bodies. The resulting situation poses a deep human problem. Mann then deftly satirizes asceticism, as it fails to offer a solution. He shows how futile man's attempts have been to divide the world between spirit and matter. When mind and body become rivals they destroy each other and all beauty is sacrificed in their warfare. "This world is not so made that spirit is fated to love only spirit and beauty only beauty. Indeed the very contrast between the two points out, with a clarity at once intellectual and beautiful, that the world's goal is union between spirit and beauty, a blessing no longer divided but whole and consummate."

Only a master could take such a weird tale and give it meaning.



Yet through it and his amazingly limpid style, he offers an answer to this ancient human problem of the relationship between spirit and matter. It seems as though he were writing in a Sanskrit idiom, using the human ingredients of humor and horror, of sensuousness and asceticism to lay bare the mystery of this strange marriage of body and mind which composes man.

In utter contrast to this queer tale is Phil Stong's forthright story *The Princess*. Here are earthly people living out their practical days on a successful farm. Reynald Edeson is a solid citizen who is left with a motherless baby sister. With old Jake as a nurse they determine to rear this child with no feminine help. Jake is a salty old reprobate who knows everything about animals on a farm and applies his knowledge to the training of Arnie. His mature tutelage makes school seem puerile. She grows up to be a big, self-reliant girl and after the death of her brother, the efficient manager of a large farm. She is too formidable for the young people of her age and finds her companionships in the humorous cynicisms of old Jake and the quiet integrity of Epworth Drummond, farmhand and lay preacher. Her romance with Weldon, the young musician, never touches her as deeply as her love for the soil.

Phil Stong has the feel of the earth and his style is as rugged and simple as the honest people who till it. His characters are all ordinary people who have flesh and blood as they walk across his pages. This is not so fine a story as *State Fair*, but it is of the same sort and gives the reader a healthy respect for the integrity of simple people.

*Quincie Bolliver* has its setting in a forlorn Texas oil town. Its farm life is forgotten as men drift hopefully in and hopelessly out of its fevered existence. Miss King paints its social pattern in raw crude oil. Quincie is a child of twelve when she drifts into Good Union with her father Curtin. He is a mule skinner and a good one, but there is little place and great scorn for a mule skinner in an oil town. His romantic careless charm surprisingly wins the heart of Judith Paradise who has transformed the large family home into a boardinghouse. She represents the former aristocracy of the town and her marriage to Curtin is a misalliance. Judith is strong and independent, chagrined that she should be so fond of her shiftless and restless husband. Quincie is reluctant to have to join the family in the big house. Living there she watches the parade of oil men come and go; she follows the sordid

drama of Fern and her husband Clay; is envious of Elsie and her success with the boys; finds a friend in old Nat Patch who knows all about oil.

The book is a fine portrayal of an oil town; its rough life, the disintegration of a community as men exploit it, the restlessness of the eternal gamble, its broken rhythm. Quincie is a sensitive child who never learns how to deal with this changing pace. She longs for the soil but her life is so bound to the hunt for oil that she always capitulates. Miss King knows the oil game and her expert knowledge provides background for the human life that is projected upon it.

The Moscow treason trials of a few years ago were an enigma to most of us. In *Darkness at Noon*, Mr. Koestler gives us an analysis of the strange psychological forces that produced them. The accusers knew they were right; their victims were negligible elements in a compelling social program. Rubashov is a composite of the Bolsheviks liquidated by Stalin. He has committed none of the crime to which later he will confess and he is convinced of the reasonableness of the action against him. Nevertheless he understands he is guilty of a deeper treason, not so much because he doubts the policy of No. 1, but because he has allowed humane feeling to cause him to question the orthodoxy of the revolutionary program and the competence of the men who control it. Koestler follows the course of Rubashov's mind—his conversation via a tapping code with the Czarist officer in the next cell, the grapevine which tells all the prisoners when someone is being executed, his fear of poisoning and of betrayal to the final utterance: "I no longer believe in my own infallibility. That is why I am lost." His treason consists in his inability to believe in a dogmatic revolutionary ideal which repudiates all former standards of ethics and morality—a faith so arrogant that it will not admit of doubt.

He is handled by two men: Ivanov, an old friend, who plays an intricate ideological game with him to persuade him that he ought to confess to what he has never done, and the young Gletkin whose tortures are more obvious. Rubashov comes finally to see "perhaps reason alone was a defective compass, which led one on such a winding, twisting course that the goal finally disappeared in the mist." Such heresy cannot be permitted in an omniscient state.

This is a remarkable book of deep psychological penetration. In it one sees why religion cannot be permitted in such a regime and why

such a revolution smashes every belief and ideal that includes a respect for human dignity. Such conscienceless materialism is no easy antagonist for the religious spirit.

In *Manhold*, Miss Bentley continues her Yorkshire studies in the early days of textiles. The book centers in the passionate conflict between old Sam Horsfall and his niece, Ann Gildersome. He is masterful, shrewd, energetic; she is a strong woman whose hates and loves finally destroy not only Sam's beloved son but the business he created and the house he built. The story is beautifully told. The people are real and the emotions are true and deep. The passions and ambitions and failures of even ordinary people create tragedy and *Manhold* is a fine portrayal of human folly.

**The Keys of the Kingdom.** By A. J. CRONIN. 344 pp. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. \$2.50.

**The Transposed Heads.** By THOMAS MANN. 196 pp. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. \$2.00.

**The Princess.** By PHIL STONG. 309 pp. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. \$2.50.

**Quincie Bolliver.** By MARY KING. 425 pp. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co. \$2.50.

**Darkness at Noon.** By ARTHUR KOESTLER. Translated from the German by Daphne Hardy. 267 pp. New York: The Macmillan Co. \$2.50.

**Manhold.** By PHYLLIS BENTLEY. 413 pp. New York: The Macmillan Co. \$2.50.

## Book Reviews

**Contemporary Religious Thought. An Anthology.** Compiled by THOMAS S. KEPLER. New York: Abingdon - Cokesbury Press. pp. 430. \$3.50.

Doctor Thomas S. Kepler, Professor of Bible and Religion at Lawrence College, has performed a real service to the reading public by his anthology, *Contemporary Religious Thought*. He has selected materials from recent writers of widely varying opinions, dealing with fundamental topics like the nature of religion, the finding of religious truth, the idea of God, the problem of evil, the meaning of worship and immortality. Among the writers represented are such men as: H. E. Fosdick, H. N. Wieman, E. E. Aubrey, the Niebuhr brothers, John Dewey, Paul Tillich, Friedrich Heiler, Will Durant, Rudolf Otto, Karl Barth, A. E. Haydon, R. M. Jones, C. C. Morrison, J. W. Krutch, E. W. Lyman and many others. It is evident that the reader of this anthology will be forced to select, to judge, and to ponder searchingly on the issues which divide, and the insights which unite modern thinkers. The selections in numerous instances are from books or journals not readily accessible, and the book places a veritable library at the disposal of the reader.

Apart from his brief but illuminating preface, Doctor Kepler makes no attempt to intrude his own views by way of comment. He does, however, rightly emphasize philosophy of religion as more fundamental than theology, while at the same time giving non-philosophical theologians their full say in their own words.

The part dealing with "The Problem of Evil" is perhaps the most challenging in its wide variety of opinion. It carries the reader through the cynical skepticism of Krutch, the optimistic humanism of Haydon and Otto, the social and psychological analyses of Harry F. Ward and William James, the finitism of the present reviewer, and the more traditional theism of E. W. Lyman, not to mention others. He who has seriously reflected on what all these men have to say should be incapable of blind belief or wishful thinking.

It is obvious that any book of selections must omit a great deal. An excellent anthology could be built up from thinkers omitted by Doctor Kepler, such as Whitehead, Hocking, Santayana, Edwin Lewis, J. B. Pratt, W. M. Horton, J. S. Bixler, Georgia Harkness, Flewelling, Macintosh, Knudson, Urban, Rall, Gilson and Maritain. It might seem pretty serious to have left out all these writers, until one reflects on the fact that on the whole their writings are both more technical and more accessible than most of what Kepler has included. Yet it is odd for an editor to include, as Kepler did, four quotations from Wieman against none from Whitehead. But the book as it stands will probably appeal to a wider circle of readers than a more philosophical selection would. It is valuable for self-examination and self-education.

An appendix contains suggestions for further readings and a biographical index of the authors quoted. This anthology is both a book to be read and reread, and is also a basis for additional study. It is strongly to be recommended

to every minister and layman who wants to feel the pulse of the modern religious mind. It would also serve as a valuable basis for group study and discussion, or as a text for college classes. For every reader of this book there is but one alternative: think or sink!

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN.

Boston University,  
Boston, Massachusetts.

### Christianity in a Changing World.

By SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE. New York: Harper and Brothers. pp. viii-204. \$2.00.

PROFESSOR CASE in this volume has given us a timely and challenging book. His students will recall that during first World War he produced *The Millennial Hope, A Phase of Wartime Thinking*. In this he brought to bear his amazing command of the resources of scholarship upon a viewpoint which enabled the religious world to obtain a useful perspective in a restricted area of theology. In the present book it is as though in a much more important phase of wartime thinking he has utilized his encyclopedic knowledge of history to provide the Christian public with a much needed and a very heartening perspective by which Christianity, present and future, may be viewed in the light of its past.

Starting from the position which he has so usefully expounded in his books and teaching, Professor Case shows that it is of the very nature of Christianity to change and to adapt. In successive chapters on Christianity as Church, Dogma, Social Gospel and Personal Piety, the changing nature of Christianity is illustrated to demonstrate that as Christianity in the past has succeeded in adapting to meet its situations of crisis, there is the probability that it may meet the pressing crises of the world's current confusion. It would be

impossible to overpraise the clarity and succinctness with which Professor Case makes his points.

For purposes of illustration, the amazingly brief and clear summaries of the viewpoints and teachings of Augustine and Anselm may be given special note. However, many another such summary is of equal value.

It must not be supposed that the remote past of Christianity alone commands Professor Case's attention. The references to Karl Barth, for example, would dispel any such idea. The reader may dissent from some of the practical recommendations proposed; Professor Case offers the suggestion that in a totalitarian world some form of a totalitarian church is needed. This feature of the book, however, need not in any sense detract from the value which is apparent on every page. It is to be hoped that this timely book will have a wide and sympathetic reading.

DONALD W. RIDDLE.

The University of Chicago,  
Chicago, Illinois.

### Who Is This King of Glory? By

WILLIAM HALLOCK JOHNSON.  
New York: American Tract Society,  
1941. pp. 217. \$1.50.

THIS volume by the president emeritus of Lincoln University is one of the books chosen for publication from among the manuscripts submitted in the publisher's 1940 Prize Book Contest. Its purpose is the same as that of the writer of the fourth Gospel. "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." It confines itself to the task of amassing evidence for its case from Bible, theology, history, religious experience, and Christian ethics. The resurrection is dealt with as the "Crowning Proof of Sonship."

The book is well written, indicates

wide reading and is definitely conservative in its point of view. As is often the case with ardent advocates, the primary interest of the author sometimes betrays him. For instance, one has done doubtful service for the historicity of the Gospels when he casts away the objectivity of the Synoptics and ranks them with John in "interestedness." Allowance is made for differing degrees in this matter, but even so one feels that in the effort to establish a common interest between the author and the Evangelists, the author has made an admission that is weakening to the cause he espouses. The attempt to establish Jesus' uniqueness by holding that the Lord's Prayer was not the prayer of Jesus but the manner in which He taught others to pray is making a point of doubtful religious value on the basis of hair-splitting interpretations. The acknowledged interest of the author leads him sometimes to accept very speculative evidence such as the citing of one biblical scholar to the effect that there is no passage in the four Gospels "giving clear evidence of a date later than 50 A. D." The primary case is too often presented as resting on a fact basis rather than a value basis.

However, the book is worthy. It is written out of long study and sincere devotion. Love for God and His Messenger, Christ, breathes through the paragraphs of the volume which has real apologetic value. A decade ago this reviewer would have found in the book much to blame, less to praise. Today, while frankly recognizing that the author has a quite different point of view, he is ready to welcome the book. The reason: In a day when the very foundations of our religion are being challenged by outside foes the different schools within the household of faith are drawing together in more sympathetic understanding. This volume is a defense of

probably THE cardinal truth of Christianity—the Divinity of our Lord. It is written by one who has served Him well, who has thought deeply in this field, and whose devotion is unquestioned. These facts alone entitle the book to an appreciative reading.

WILLIAM K. ANDERSON.

Educational Director of Commission on Courses of Study of The Methodist Church,  
Nashville, Tennessee.

**Your Child and God.** By ROBBIE TRENT. Chicago: Willett Clark, 1941. pp. 145. \$1.50.

THE author of this book is a well known and widely influential leader in the Southern Baptist Church. Out of her rich experience she brings practical help to parents who sincerely desire to rear their children in the Christian faith and yet have no plan other than to send them off to Sunday school on a Sunday morning. The Christian faith is represented as emotional security based on the realization of the loving care of the Heavenly Father who is known through Jesus. Associated with this security is the willingness to meet everyday problems with courage, confidence and kindness and with freedom from harassing fears of danger or death. Experiences of children who have developed this general attitude are recounted in popular and attractive style. About half of the volume is given to suggestions for Bible reading in the home, story telling, individual and family prayers and the observance of Sunday.

Four main propositions sustain the book and are referred to again and again. They are these: (1) In children's religious development the home is primary and central; (2) Our main concern should be with emotions and attitudes



rather than with intellectual concepts; (3) It is what parents themselves believe that matters, rather than what they consciously try to impart; (4) Modern children want and need the same simple, loving and uncritical Bible teaching that has built up the strong church leaders of the past.

Many parents will see their own problems reflected in these chapters and will find wholesome suggestions that they can follow. It is a matter of regret, however, that the parents to whom this book is addressed have been given no help in understanding the development of experiences and ideas recorded in the Bible. Nor have they been helped to make concrete to children the universality of God and His judgment on a society which denies His loving-kindness. There are only two references to Negroes in the book. One of them describes the beautiful singing at the funeral of a Negro "Mammy" and the other refers in passing to a Negro maid. A whole group of children's questions are not even mentioned, questions which, if answered honestly, would tend to destroy the emotional security which is here identified with religion. Children brought up along the lines suggested would be contented in their surroundings, amiable and kind. Holy and heroic souls need a different diet.

ADELAIDE T. CASE.

Teachers College,  
New York, New York.

#### **A New Heaven and a New Earth.**

By EDWIN LEWIS. New York:  
Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 1941.  
pp. 248. \$2.00.

There are three things that impress one in most of Dr. Lewis's books. One is his deep and intense religious earnestness. Another is his thorough biblical

and theological scholarship coupled with vigorous and independent reflection. And the third is a quite definite leaning toward theological conservatism. This leaning is less pronounced in the above book than, for instance, in his *Christian Manifesto*, but it appears in both. Doctor Lewis is in revolt against the naturalistic forms of modern humanism and liberalism, and rightly so. But he seems to think that this revolt can be made effective only through the revival of theological theories that many regard as outmoded. It is this characteristic that gives a certain distinctiveness to his theological position in Methodist circles.

*A New Heaven and a New Earth* contains the Quillian Lectures for 1941 delivered at Emory University. Its main thesis is that "heaven makes earth"; that "men will give practical expression to whatsoever they deem highest," and that, consequently, "a new earth presupposes a new heaven." The word "heaven" is used metaphorically as a synonym for "that body of belief and conviction which is in control of any man's life." It means about the same as the word "ideal." As there is a conflict of ideals, so there is a "conflict of heavens." And to say that heaven makes earth is thus equivalent to saying that "it is the ideal that controls the actual." In seeking to reform the world or create a "new earth," it is, therefore, of primary importance that we have the right kind of ideal or "heaven."

The larger part of the book is devoted to an exposition of the development of the biblical idea of God or the ideal world. This is admirably done. Especially fine is the chapter on the Gospel of John, called "This is That." By "That" is meant the traditional apocalypticism of the first century, and by

"This" the Johannine spiritualization of it.

In expounding the content of the Christian "heaven" or spiritual ideal Doctor Lewis lays stress on certain theories of sin and the Trinity, with which many will find it difficult to agree. He seems to hold that a sub-volitional conception of sin is essential to the Christian doctrine of salvation. If sin is in every instance a free act, it might be overcome through human effort alone, and in that case there would be no salvation in the proper sense of the term. There must, therefore, be superhuman sources of sin. But for most people sin that is not grounded in freedom is not sin, and to de-ethicize sin is to lead inevitably to confusion. No relief is obtained by resorting to paradox. Rather does the cult of the paradoxical make the confusion worse confounded.

Virtually the same may be said of the social interpretation of the Trinity which Doctor Lewis seems to regard as a presupposition of the Christian conception of God as love. How this interpretation can escape tritheism, I never have been able to see. The distinction suggested by Doctor Lewis between the personality of God and the individuality of Father, Son and Holy Spirit affords me no relief. The fact is that his theory of the Trinity and also his theory of original sin presuppose a Platonic or Neo-Platonic background and are untenable from the standpoint of modern personalism.

But these theological divergences from a consistent Christian personalism do not vitally affect the main thesis of the book. This thesis stands in its own right. To expound it from the Christian point of view and to apply it to present-day conditions is all that is needed. And this Doctor Lewis has done in a very interesting, able and im-

pressive manner. The reader will find in this latest book of his much that is fresh, stimulating and inspiring.

ALBERT C. KNUDSON.

Boston University School of Theology,  
Boston, Massachusetts.

**The Philosophy of George Santayana.** Edited by PAUL ARTHUR SCHILPP, of Northwestern University. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press. \$4.00.

THIS is Volume Two in The Library of Living Philosophers, Volume One being The Philosophy of John Dewey. Other volumes are to follow at the rate of about one a year.

It is not designed that these volumes shall take the place of the original writings of the philosophers under consideration. It is the purpose of the editor to introduce students of philosophy to the philosophical thought of the greatest living philosophers. He believes that this can best be done by a series of expository and critical articles written by the leading exponents and opponents of the philosopher's thought; by a reply to these commentators and critics by the philosopher himself; by an intellectual autobiography when it can be had, or an authoritative and authorized biography; and by bibliography of the philosopher's writings. This method develops interest and secures clarity—so far as philosophical clarity can be secured.

This general purpose and plan are followed in the volume under review. The first article, "A General Confession," is the intellectual autobiography of Santayana. There follows eighteen expository and critical articles by the exponents and opponents of Santayana's philosophical thought. The topics of these articles are so chosen by the editor as to present a synoptic view of Santayana's philosophy. Some of these critics

are quite friendly, some are neutral and some are quite hostile. This friendly struggle among intellectual giants quickens interest and clarifies thought. In a long article of more than one hundred pages, Santayana replies to his critics. Fifty-seven pages are devoted to a bibliography of the philosopher's writings. These writings are listed in their chronological order from 1880 to 1940. The book is well indexed.

Santayana was a Spaniard. For forty years he lived in the United States, but he never sought citizenship here. He was educated in New England. He studied philosophy in Harvard University under William James, Josiah Royce and Francis W. Parker. There he learned philosophy, there he taught philosophy and there he developed his philosophy. For his philosophy he is little indebted to his great teachers. He is more indebted to Plato and Spinoza. While others stimulated his thought and directed his attention to philosophical problems, his philosophy is his own. He is a traditionalist, and the outstanding traditional elements in his philosophy are Platonism, materialism and skepticism.

He was a prolific writer. His published writings fill fifteen volumes. On a great variety of subjects he wrote. Were he not so well known as a philosopher, he would rank as a great poet. One of his best sellers is a novel, *The Last Puritan*. His mature philosophical thought is comprised in his *Realms of Being*. Of these realms there are four: Essence, Matter, Truth and Spirit. To each of these a volume is devoted.

CHARLES E. FORLINES.

Westminster Theological Seminary,  
Westminster, Maryland.

#### **And Great Shall Be Your Reward.**

By Paul S. Minear. Yale Press. \$1.00.  
A dissertation on the origins of the Christian view of salvation.

#### **Biography of the Gods.** By A.

EUSTACE HAYDON. Macmillan,  
New York: 1941. pp. 352. \$2.50.

PROFESSOR HAYDON tells the story of the gods with beauty and lucidity. In a most gratifying way he combines serious scholarship with a vivid, sometimes eloquent, narrative. The first two chapters trace the origin and development of belief in gods from primitive times. The third chapter recounts the history of "the gods who died"—for example, those of Babylonia and Assyria, Greece and Rome. The remainder of the book is devoted to the deities of the great living religions.

The biographical method enables the author to treat each god, when the facts warrant, as a distinct, unfolding individuality, whose character is modified and adjusted to meet the changing circumstances of the men he serves. There is a natural tendency on the part of students to stereotype their conception of a particular religion around a few great principles or achievements. By tracing the career of each deity from the beginning (and sometimes through complex relationships with others) down to modern times or to the moment when the god passed into limbo, Professor Haydon succeeds in showing that the history of religion must be understood as an exercise of vital power far more than merely the interplay of intellectual theories. Indeed, one of his favorite themes is the perennial tension between the need for support from a personal Power and the philosophical quest for an impersonal Absolute.

There are also disadvantages in the author's method, however. Although he writes sympathetically, he manifests the kind of sympathy with which one would enter into a child's imaginative game. Some stories may be nicer than others. As to that, the narrator does

not presume to pass judgment; but they are all stories. Fundamentally, all the gods are products of man's emotional needs and his quest for the good life; they differ because the cultural, human conditions differ; yet, in the end, they all have the same status. This general assumption will not commend itself, of course, to "believers." Doubtless the adherents of any religion will feel that one who writes (however sympathetically) from the outside is incapable of appreciating the true import of their beliefs. Specifically, Christians will feel that the author's methodological assumptions have made it impossible for him to do justice to the essential and unique connection between salvation and the historical Person of Jesus Christ. Professor Haydon devotes some attention to parallels and organic connections between Christianity and other religions; and these are, quite properly, the historian's affair. But instead of simply noting questions concerning revelation, which fall outside his task *qua* historian, he writes the entire book as a propagandist for convictions of his own. His position combines the humanist's certainty that the gods are merely imaginative constructs, with a somewhat complacent agnosticism concerning the ultimate questions which belief in God attempts to answer.

Presumably Professor Haydon is capable of viewing his own book from one standpoint as an incident in the history of opinion, and from another standpoint as relevant to questions of religious truth. Therefore he should not disregard the importance of a similar distinction in connection with belief in God. Yet nowhere does he seriously discuss the possibility that all the religions are quests in response to a "real" God instead of imaginative projections of natural forces and human ideals. His

bias constrains him to represent the Christian God of today as having degenerated into a host of hazy philosophical abstractions. In the list of conflicting witnesses (p. 282) he includes Comte, Spencer, Overstreet, Dewey and others, who—I venture to think—would be surprised to find themselves classified as Christian theologians. More important is the fact that if diversity of opinion among philosophers does not undermine the possibility that they are all seeking to understand the same world, neither does diversity of opinion among religious thinkers suffice to show that there may not be genuinely reciprocal relations between them and God.

In his concluding chapter (on "the twilight of the gods") the author writes as though the aspiration and guidance which hitherto have been associated with belief in God could now be diverted entirely (at least among the enlightened) to the human enterprise. After writing a book which shows so admirably how religion never has been detached from the human enterprise, he should know that the very character of "faith in man" and the ultimate status of "all his beloved moral values" (p. 329) will continue to depend upon the reality or unreality of God. Because this insight is lacking, one lays down the book with the feeling that a skillful reporter has witnessed a great drama, has recounted its happenings with fidelity, and yet has missed the main point of the play.

DAVID E. ROBERTS.

Union Theological Seminary,  
New York, New York.

**The Church of Our Fathers.** By Roland H. Bainton. Scribner's. \$2.50. The history of the Church unfolded in a fascinating pageant of pages illustrated by pen and picture for younger readers.

**Making the Most of the Rest of Life.** By KARL RUFF STOLZ. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. pp. 416. 1941. \$1.50.

THIS book is intended to tell middle-aged people or "those of riper years and experience" "how to live gracefully and wholesomely during the second half of life." The period of adolescence has long been recognized as one of stress and strain with physical changes, new mental horizons and spiritual urges that affect all of later life. Doctors, lawyers and some preachers have also recognized that a similar period of adjustment faces mature men and women. We have talked, some of us, about the "foolish forties," the "fatal fifties," and some have referred to the "sexy or senile sixties," but there has not been much understanding of early middle age nor have ministers had much material to put in the hands of people facing the beginning of the second half of life. Dr. Stolz's most recent book faces in frank and interesting fashion many of the problems of middle life and old age.

A husband and wife had returned home from a party given by elderly friends. The hostess had retained much of her youthful beauty which was crowned not only with eyes alight, but with a beauty of character and sweetness of disposition that endeared her not only to the members of her family, but to friends and casual acquaintances. The young wife said to her husband, "I wouldn't mind growing old if I could be as beautiful and gracious as Mrs. So and So." To which the husband replied, "You can be, but if you are to have a beautiful old age, you must begin now."

This book is an excellent one to put in the hands of men and women who are disturbed by certain physical and

other changes they begin to meet in the forties. Such ordinary affairs as money, rules of health, rest, exercise are among the topics interestingly discussed. Second marriages, adult education, the making of new friends and solitude are also included. The author is insisting that success in the second half of life depends on recognition of those elements that will make life normal. He says: "Basic activities and interests make and keep an individual normal. First, the normal man is usefully if not gainfully employed. Second, he is wholesomely related to other people. Third, he is honest and capable enough to examine and improve himself. Fourth, he has a sympathetic understanding of the situations others face. Fifth, he cultivates a tension-reducer in the form of an avocation or hobby. Sixth, and finally, he has a sound philosophy of life which gives meaning to his world and support to his conduct. These six competencies and developments are not luxuries without which a man can live normally, but indispensabilities. Furthermore, they interpenetrate. The first five are regulated and controlled by the sixth." Along with this there is a deep undertone in this book rising out of the definite assurance that "life can be good," with all the deep significance that can be read into the term.

J. N. R. SCORE.

First Methodist Church,  
Fort Worth, Texas.

**Roads to Reality.** By Robert MacCowan. Revell. \$1.00. Lectures on everyday happenings on the road of life.

**Current Religious Thought.** By Charles S. MacFarland. Revell. \$1.50. An anthology of forty books reviewing the "earnest and sustained thinking" of contemporary religious literature.



**The Work of Jesus in Christian Thought.** By ALEXANDER MCCREA. London: The Epworth Press (Edgar C. Barton). 1939. pp. 288. Price 6s.

One of the subjects of perennial interest to religious thinkers in the British Isles is that of the work of Jesus as understood and interpreted in Christian history. More than two decades ago Dean Hastings Rashdall published his exhaustive and voluminous Bampton Lectures on *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*; a few years ago Principal Sidney Cave surveyed the same ground from a different point of view; now Alexander McCrea of Edgehill College, Belfast, restates the problem and retells the story. McCrea, however, has a different public in view. He is concerned with students in the Universities and the arts who have been repelled by certain interpretations of the life and death of Jesus, or who have been confused hopelessly by the whole problem. Thus his work, while historical in content, is apologetic in purpose.

Since the work of Jesus, in the thought of the author, was conditioned by or grounded in the sin of men and their consequent alienation from God, he begins with an analysis of the concept sin. He defines sin as "anything in our lives, to which we consent, that conflicts with the divine purpose and alienates us from God." As such, it is "always the act of one moral agent against another and is the product of personal freedom" (p. 28). Current tendencies which minimize the significance of sin and magnify the goodness of man are then opposed. In the chapter which follows he discusses the men who crucified Jesus, in order to indicate that they, rather than God, were responsible for Jesus' death. The discussion proceeds with an analysis of the

New Testament accounts of the death and resurrection of Jesus in order to clarify the issues for beginners in the field. The rest of the book, with the exception of two concluding chapters, is devoted to the history of three main theories of the work of Jesus: The Greek or Ransom theory, the Latin or Satisfaction theory, and the Abelardian or Moral Influence theory. In one of the concluding chapters the author presents, briefly, some current trends.

The author is convinced that each of the main theories contains vital truth. This means that he is unwilling either to accept any one of them as final or that he is ready to exclude any of them from serious consideration. Furthermore, he believes that a study of the history of these theories will prove that such theories are conditioned by the age in which they arose, and that each succeeding age requires a restatement of the essential or timeless truth basic to all of them. It appears evident, however, that the author has little interest in or appreciation of theories of the work of Jesus which do not presuppose the validity of the historic views of the relation of God to nature and man. This comes to clear expression in his treatment of Schleiermacher, from whose theory of feeling he dissents and whose tendencies toward "pantheism" he deplors.

Professor McCrea deserves credit for writing an interesting and informative volume. It will repay well the time spent in its reading and study. The book contains, however, certain statements and tendencies which are subject to question. It is somewhat confusing to use the term "Christian" when one actually means "biblical." A theory will be said to diverge from the "Christian" point of view when what the author actually means is that it diverges from one or several of the biblical points of



view. Again, in his attempt to laud the Christian religion he states that "no pagan deity was ever conceived as coming to the help of his suppliant devotees and providing the means by which he could return to fellowship and joy" (p. 278). Even a cursory acquaintance with the welter of religions in the ancient Roman world would make necessary serious modification of such a statement. Finally, it appears somewhat difficult to justify the author's organization of his materials. Fully as much space is devoted to the discussion of the New Testament theories of the work of Jesus as is given to the nineteen centuries which follow. Despite these criticisms, the volume should be of real value to the public to whom the author was writing.

WILLIAM H. BERNHARDT.

The Iliff School of Theology,  
Denver, Colorado.

**The Ethical Ideals of Jesus.** By G. BROMLEY OXNAM. New York: Abingdon - Cokesbury Press. pp. 135. 1941. \$1.00.

In a day when most of the world's influential voices are not so much communicating with, as they are "talking past," one another, these five addresses would provoke a fervent Methodist "Amen"; a standing vote of thanks from an ecclesiastical assembly, and even a "Hear! Hear!" from a dignified British gathering.

Written by a bishop whose harvest of the quiet eye has had the planet for cultivation, there is solid wisdom in these pages for all who, perforce, must do their travel by study chair. We are taken to Russia, China, France and India even in the first chapter, and visit London, 10 Downing Street, and the Berlin White House in chapter two. Ere we conclude this small book, we share ex-

periences in France, Holland, Switzerland, and, of course, these United States. Impressive from the standpoint of clergy rates, the dust of geography gets in the eyes a little. After all, it is only because we can exchange eyes with Bishop Oxnam as a spaceless and timeless *episkopos* for God that the report is worthy.

There is a sort of familiar sound about the foundation principles expressed in the first of these lectures. The absolute worth of personality; the oneness of man; the common good; equality of rights, and co-operation instead of competition, which this instructed scribe bringeth out of his treasure, belong rather to the old than to the new. Indeed, they are somewhat shopworn, and hardly eligible for that "new influx of the divinity into the mind" which Emerson claims for generalizations.

The bishop sees clearly that there is a great gulf fixed between the ideal and the real, and he, like the rest of us, seems compelled to fall back on man as a "sinner," on "prayer" and "a change of heart." There is a frank acknowledgment of "dilemma," and the Christian is left to determine whether the ideals are to be brought in by resistance or nonresistance (p. 58ff).

Selfish nationalism, economic imperialism, and militarism are under indictment in chapter three. It would seem that the author is willing to divide honors for the new day with increased legislation, collective ownership, "educational processes," and better international understanding (pp. 61, 83). The fact remains that at present our Christianity seems almost as far removed from the realization of these massive ideals as is a College Panhellenic Society from the glory that is Greece. The diagnosis of our ills is penetrating, but these pages show how difficult is the task

of passing from analysis to reconstruction.

If it be not ungracious to register a cavil, in the recognition of all that is stimulating in these lectures, the present reviewer could wish that the theological basis had been broader—more Theocentric, and Christocentric only because the latter is included. The obvious relativities in Gospel criticism frequently put the things that matter most at the mercy of the things which matter least. In seeking for the ethical ideals of Jesus, do we really need to see *what* He saw, as much as to see *as* He saw?

W. P. LEMON.

First Church,  
University of Michigan,  
Ann Arbor, Michigan.

**The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915.** By CHARLES HOWARD HOPKINS. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1940. \$3.00.

IN his study of the origins of the social gospel in American Protestantism, Doctor Hopkins has written a book long needed both by scholars and by churchmen. Visser 't'Hooft attempted to set the social gospel movement in the flow of Western European thought, but there has been a lack of information concerning the rise of the movement in America itself.

Doctor Hopkins shows that the social gospel did not originate at the beginning of the twentieth century but goes back to the period between the Civil War and the turn of the century. He is aware of the connections of the social gospel with the anti-slavery movement, although he is inclined to think that the social gospel was delayed by the absorption of so many American Protestants in the anti-slavery crusade. The social gospel grew out of the coincidence of

industrial development and scientific thinking during the latter half of the nineteenth century. Doctor Hopkins treats in some detail the various men and movements which contributed to the rise of the social gospel, and his volume is in many ways a source book for the students of religion of the period.

The dominant ideas which characterized the social gospel were the assumption of the immanence of God, a solidaristic view of society, belief in a progressive realization of the kingdom of heaven upon earth, and biblical authority in the social teachings of Jesus. Doctor Hopkins rightly insists upon the religious character of the social gospel. "Its great prophets were men of spiritual, even mystical, genius whose message was characterized by a fundamentally religious and evangelical fervor." The social gospel did, however, exert a very definite influence upon the conceptions of God, man, sin, salvation, and other Christian doctrines. However, Doctor Hopkins is right in saying that the movement was led by children of their age, "drawing their ideology from the intellectual environment and rarely pausing to examine it or to follow basic assumptions to their logical conclusion." In their applications of what they conceived to be the gospel, the leaders were pioneers and evangelists rather than sociologists or logicians. This, thinks Doctor Hopkins, is nowhere more obvious than in the question of the use of force. "Could the law of love become operative through socialism without imposing its will upon a minority that clung to private ownership?" Doctor Hopkins merely remarks that the resolution of such problems was left to a later generation.

In dealing with the history of the Church in America from 1865 to 1915, Doctor Hopkins is concerned with the reaction of the Church to the problems

of industry, and, therefore, is inclined to see the entire problem of the Church in relation to this interest. One of the difficulties in understanding the attitude of the churches yesterday and today is caused by the tendency of modern historians to look through the past for beginnings of movements later to become dominant. Then when those indications are found, contemporary men and movements are judged in relation to them. It exaggerates to say, "With phenomenal speed the industrial revolution converted a peaceful agricultural country almost overnight into an urban nation of bustling factories whose operatives were no longer skilled artisans but machine tenders." Actually this country was not filled with machines, nor were the majority of its people urban until very recent years. During the '80's and '90's and the early part of this century the majority of American people lived in small towns or on the farm and were engaged in more or less agricultural employment.

In the same way it is not quite true to say that Protestantism was slow to grasp the meaning of its social problems in the latter part of the nineteenth century because of its preoccupation with traditional social, missionary and charitable enterprises. This is a very important fact, and Doctor Hopkins does well to point it out; but it is also true that the Church was occupied with the affairs of the people who made up the Church, and most of them were not in industry in the 1870's and the 1880's.

Doctor Hopkins very rightly points out that in spite of the fact that the first World War ended the era of optimism and progress in which social Christianity developed, the social viewpoint has permeated the thinking of Christendom in significant ways. It may be regarded by Europeans as simply the product of American *aktivismus* and

the present war may have shattered many utopias, but the social gospel has made a contribution which will not be forgotten. Whether the Church of the future will regard the social gospel as so large a part of Christianity as Doctor Hopkins seems to think is another matter.

UMPHREY LEE.

Southern Methodist University,  
Dallas, Texas.

**Young Leaders in Action.** By ISAAC KELLEY BECKES. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. pp. 216. \$1.75.

*Young Leaders in Action* is a discussion of methods and aims of work with youth in the Church set forth in rather unusual form. It is the story of a young people's society in the course of which problems arise and are met by the characters in the book. The author's ideas are set to work in actual situations, and the situations are based on occurrences in his ministry.

The central figure is a young man chosen, at the beginning of the story, to be president of his society. In his sense of unfitness he seeks his pastor's advice. Encouraged and helped by the pastor, he undertakes the task. For three years he wrestles with the difficulties and needs of his group. At the end of the story he emerges from a highly successful experience, himself a deepened and consecrated man, prepared by the training gained in the youth group, for a larger usefulness in the entire work of the church. This is the chief point of the book: to show the necessity for definite training if the Church is to have leaders, and to show the place the young people's society ought to fill in providing such training. This one young man under the influence of his pastor and of other Christian leaders, acquires ideals, devo-

tional habits, knowledge of the Church, vision of the Kingdom and skill in applying Christian methods to the actual affairs of people.

The important question of the proper aims of a young people's organization is handled in the form of a conversation between Ed Smith, the new president, and the pastor. The young man faces at the start the problem of exactly what his group should do, and is aware that deeper things than having a good time or keeping a local church alive must be involved. In a discussion the pastor then develops the proper aims, showing them to be service of the spiritual, intellectual, social and physical needs of all the youth of the congregation. The effective application of these aims is shown in the subsequent events in the personal life of young Mr. Smith and in the work of the society under his leadership. The society is organized. Its tendency to dissension is overcome. A summer camp is conducted. Social life is made more wholesome. The climax comes when, as a result of the activity of this one society, the whole youth program of the congregation is reorganized on a unified plan.

Not all the suggestions of Mr. Beckes will meet with universal approval. For instance, the setting up of a recreational program in the church following the meeting each Sunday night is a matter a great many will question. But the main contentions of the book are good and they are helpfully presented. Especially to be commended is the emphasis on co-operation with the pastor and with the total program of the congregation; and the description of how real endeavor to follow the Spirit of Christ can be the basis of successful Christian work.

PAUL F. BARACKMAN.

Central Presbyterian Church,  
Brooklyn, New York.

**World's Need of Christ.** By CHARLES A. ELLWOOD. New York: Abingdon - Cokesbury Press, 1941. pp. 237. \$2.00.

USUALLY when I find some economist or sociologist writing about Christ or the Church, I am prepared for pages of material with which I find myself out of agreement. A most refreshing exception to this rule is a book by Dr. Charles A. Ellwood of Duke University, bearing the title *World's Need of Christ*. Not for many a day have I read a book so refreshing to a minister and a church member or to any Christian person. Those half-dozen chapters are filled with a most interestingly written statement from a Christian standpoint, regarding the neglect of the central factor in our Christian life and our church program.

From the very first chapter in which we are reminded of our failure to maintain Christ in our daily life down to the end of the book on the Christian reconstruction of our Christian civilization, one is gripped by the simple, straightforward manner in which the author points out our neglect of Him.

The book is exceedingly practical. It is also fearless in its statements in those areas where there has been discussion and debate. From a minister's viewpoint, science and philosophy, business and industry, political and international relationships are dealt with in a very definite way and with a very definite purpose, now placing Christ at the center of all these relationships. The author does not forget, nor allow us to forget, that in our complacency we have neglected Christ even in our religion and in the Church. How important is the message of this book at this very hour. It should be read by every pastor and every business layman, as well as every educator

throughout the length and breadth of this land.

C. OSCAR JOHNSON.

Third Baptist Church,  
St. Louis, Missouri.

**A Testament of Devotion.** By THOMAS R. KELLY, published posthumously by Harper & Brothers. New York: pp. iv-124. \$1.

The foreword to this book was written by Rufus M. Jones while an extended biographical memoir is prepared by Douglas V. Steere. It is a book on devotion with a deeply mystical message. A rare book because the call for it and the interest in the inner life are so rare in this day. Dr. Kelly has revealed a new and surprising approach to the deeply spiritual life. Unlike many devotional books written a generation ago, it is almost devoid of the trite stock phrases of groups of writers and speakers. But there is a reason for this. The author combines a rare training and experience in both the natural sciences and philosophy. His approach is fresh, original and sometimes strikingly mystical if not mysterious. His book is an effort to induct both the lay and professional reader into the sacred precincts of the inner life.

The author began his life under humble and adverse circumstances but in a pious Quaker home and community. The book is written primarily, but not exclusively, for the Friends. He warns the reader that it is not for any cult or group, but for any who sense their need and who will enter this inner sanctuary of the soul. His discriminating scholarship enables him to sense the relation of the inner and the outer, the spiritual and the physical.

It is not given to many even devout souls to appreciate the mysteries of the inner life. To Doctor Kelly it was. With an almost intuitive talent he draws the curtain of these galleries and invites

his friends to enter. The very first paragraph reveals his purpose. "Deep within us all there is an amazing inner sanctuary of the soul, a holy place to which we may continuously return." He claims that such practice of inner orientation, of inward worship and listening, is not for special religious groups, small religious orders, for monks in cloisters, but for any and for all. In his chapter on the Blessed Community, he insists that in this fellowship, cultural, educational and racial differences are leveled and unlettered men are at ease with the truly humble scholar who lives in the Life, and the scholar listens with joy and openness to the precious experiences of God's dealing with the workingman. His chapter on Holy Obedience reveals the acid test of Christian living. There are plenty who follow our Lord halfway but few the other half. Religion to most of us, says Professor James, "exists as a dull habit; in others as an acute fever." This state of complete obedience and self-renunciation and sensitive listening is "breath-taking."

His final word is an earnest exhortation to the simplification of life. One must learn to say "No" as well as "Yes." We have too many irons in the fire. We are pulled and hauled along by a program of even good works. Religion is not something to be added to our other duties.

In brief, here is a book for the thoughtful reader, who wants to go down into the subterranean realms of human experience and there breathe the pure rare atmosphere of the holy life.

W. G. CLIPPINGER.

Otterbein College,  
Westerville, Ohio.

**God's Ravens.** By Julia Lake Kellersberger. Revell. \$1.50. A missionary's life and work in the Belgian Congo.



**Christian Roots of Democracy in America.** By ARTHUR E. HOLT. New York: Friendship Press, 1941. pp. xvii-187. \$1.00.

"It is the contention of this book that . . . when we establish churches, we are saving democracy from within." The reference is to Protestant churches, for "democracy in political life and democracy in religious life reinforce each other or die together." This forthright thesis the author maintains first by a novel analysis of the democratic ideal which pervades biblical literature, and second by an inquiry into the relationship of religious concepts and democratic philosophy at crucial moments in American history. The author concludes that while democracy and Christianity in this country have never equated, each in its present form owes a vital debt to the other.

This symbiotic relationship of democracy and Protestantism in America is now threatened by the growth of organized prejudice, by the concentration of economic power, and by world imperialism. Will it survive? The author believes it depends on "whether or not democracy can maintain its central core of values. . . . Even though Germany and Italy should be beaten into the ground, the basic problem of democracy would not have been settled."

This is an exciting book. Its style is discursive rather than expository, and the relevance of some of its pages to the main theme is difficult to discover. But it is suggestive, fresh and realistic.

GILBERT H. BARNES

Ohio Wesleyan University,  
Delaware, Ohio.

**Pastoral Psychology.** By Karl Ruf Stolz. Abingdon-Cokesbury. (Revised) \$2.50. The public demand for this up-to-date text of a decade ago proves its worth.

**Jesus As They Remembered Him.** By CHESTER WARREN QUIMBY. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York: 1941. pp. 220. \$1.50.

IF ALL the books which were written about Jesus were collected, verily they would "fill the world." And yet each new year sees other books about Him. Men perennially find Him a subject worthy of study and people always are ready to read about Him. So, doubtless, books will continue to appear and if there is not much that is new or original in any one of them they will not fail to suggest some fresh approaches which had not yet been pointed out before or will reveal some new facet of His amazing character which had not been clearly seen by others.

The book under review attempts to present Jesus as He was remembered by those who knew Him. It is based upon the Gospels which are the only records we have of what they remembered. It is not a critical study in any sense, although the author specifically states that he has taken into account the work of the best critical scholarship. With the findings of the scholars he is, he asserts, in perfect accord, but he is not in agreement with the conclusions based on these findings: that we can never know Jesus as they remembered Him but only Jesus as they interpreted Him. Despite all that is questioned in the Gospels, we can, he avers, find sufficient facts upon which to base a life of Jesus.

So he goes to the Gospels, mainly the synoptics, but also to John in which, along with interpretation, he believes that there is a substantial synoptic element and from the relatively unquestioned facts, the author builds up his picture of The Nazarene. Naturally he starts with his environment, and he brings it to life. Using straightforward language which the man on the street will



understand, he paints a vivid picture of his surroundings. I do not know where it has been better done is such brief compass. It was an unsanitary world, a diseased world, a toiling world, a poverty-stricken world, a crowded, noisy, slow-moving world. It was a world of suspicion and ignorance; a world of cruelty and brutality for man and beast.

Then His heritage—of family, of course, but also His cultural heritage, His world view, His national heritage, His religious heritage—all suggested by Gospel utterances, provide a background against which to see and try to understand Him. In successive chapters the author writes of Jesus' body, His physical characteristics, His experiences, His mind, His emotions, His motives, His unpopularity, His distinctive characteristics, His perfection, His Gospel and His achievements.

Out of an intimate acquaintance with the Gospels, born of years of study and teaching college classes in Bible, and out of a rich experience of study and travel in Palestine, he has written one of the most readable and convincing books on the life of Jesus that has appeared in a long time. His style is pungent. He knows how to stab one awake by the use of unusual and sometimes almost shocking comparison of Jesus' day with something in our own. He is best in his earlier chapters. He becomes more homiletic in the later ones. One feels that there is a much larger subjective element in his discussion of Jesus' perfection, and His gospel; that it is less certainly the thought of Jesus Himself, and perhaps more that of the author's reflection about Him. But it could hardly be otherwise. And whether it be wholly true to Jesus as He was, it is good reading and very suggestive.

Here is a book which a layman can easily read. It is vivid, interesting, stimulating. If it be not the definitive picture

of the Man of Galilee—what book can ever hope to be that!—it is nevertheless well worth reading and studying. It deserves a wide circulation.

CHARLES S. BRADEN.

Northwestern University,  
Evanston, Illinois.

**The Bible Doctrine of Salvation. A Study of the Atonement.** By C. RYDER SMITH. The Epworth Press, London, 1941. pp. 320. 7sh. 6d.

This volume is another indication that the long lack of interest in biblical theology has come to an end. Various factors were responsible for this lack of interest, one of them being the critical movement which emphasized the differences in outlook and teaching between the various sacred writers, thus destroying the concept of a biblical theology. The tide has turned, however. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the distinctions to be made between the various writings are only half the truth, and the less important half at that. Along with the diversity can be traced a broad unity of concept and teaching. Were this not the case the cultural stream which one readily describes as the Judaeo-Christian would never have existed. Along with the increasing realization of this unity there has come upon us the urgent need of discovering or recovering a spiritual basis for modern society. Hence the return, the desperate return perhaps, to the teaching of the Bible.

The volume in hand undertakes a significant aspect of this task. The author maintains that a single doctrine of salvation and atonement is to be traced in the Bible, and that this can best be stated in psychological thought forms. To this doctrine he gives the name "societary," using the term to designate the character

of human nature as both individual and corporate. The "societary" character of man includes fellowship with God, which is salvation. The possibility of this fellowship rests on the new life which Christ brought into the world, which, again because of man's "societary" nature, could be made available only by one who was like man and yet without sin. The method of treatment is chronological, first the Old Testament and then the New Testament, the citations from the various books being copious. The discussion does not always confine itself to the single theme, but digresses at times to include judgments on a number of related topics.

The volume thus undertakes a task which is important both from scholarly and practical points of view. It avoids formal phraseology and historically conditioned concepts. Its interpretations are frequently illuminating. In certain respects, however, it leaves something to be desired. In the handling of biblical passages the critical studies of the last two or three decades are for the most part neglected. While this involves no serious consequences in many instances, in others it confuses and vitiates the endeavor to trace the development of ideas. In the second place, the proposal to utilize psychological data for the understanding of biblical teachings is not taken seriously. The author's description of his purpose leads one to expect a greater use of this material. One also feels the need of some exposition of the interpretation advanced which would relate it to the historic views of the Atonement.

HARVIE BRANSCOMB.

Duke University,  
Durham, North Carolina.

**Secretly Armed.** By Allan A. Hunter. Harper. \$1.50. A plea for the "better armor—of all-inclusive love."

### **The Christian Interpretation of Sex.**

By OTTO A. PIPER. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1941. pp. 234. \$2.00.

THE book is divided into four parts and contains nineteen chapters. Part One is "On the Way to New Insights" in which Professor Piper discusses the ancient ideas of sex as expressed in the Old Testament and the beginning of the modern views. Part Two is "The Biblical Interpretation of Sex" in which the author interprets sex from the teachings of the Bible. Part Three is "The Divine Ordinances of Sex Life." Part Four is "Your Life and Mine." This is a splendid discussion in four chapters of

The knowledge of sin  
The burden of sin  
The gospel of forgiveness  
Life in truth.

The author accepts the Bible literally, as is shown on page 9 when he says that man and woman are essentially complementary to each other; and he proves this by saying the story of the creation of Eve from Adam's ribs makes it plain that man and woman are regarded as essentially belonging to each other.

The author maintains that when two people have sex relations for the first time it creates a bond between them that lasts throughout life, a bond that cannot be broken. He says (p. 183), "For the first coition with a person binds one to that person not only for the period of this intercourse but for his entire life."

The author, although having read Freud's interpretation of sex, apparently has misinterpreted it in some way when he says (p. 36): "The Bible, however, does not agree with those modern psychologists who hold that sex itself is the very centre of our nature and that whatever a man does is in one way or another a manifestation of his sex."

Psychoanalysis teaches, as Freud maintained, that not all our emotional difficulties but many of them are caused by problems of our love life and they use *love* in a much broader sense than sex.

The book is carefully written with a somewhat heavy style but so filled is each page with material that I found myself underlining from one to a dozen sentences on each page. To read and understand this book requires close attention.

The author's complete acceptance of the Bible, his evident unshaken faith in the teaching of the gospel, give a driving force to his book that makes it moving and appealing.

The chapters in Part Four make a strong appeal to the person who feels himself burdened with sin and guilt and who finds himself unable to adjust to normal sex life. To the sin-burdened soul, the last part of the book must bring deep solace.

This book is unique in that a Protestant theologian has had the courage and wisdom to discuss frankly on an adult level the purpose, the perplexities and the difficulties of the sex life. I think that this book would be of interest to all ministers and also to those who are dealing in religious education. The author has proved his thesis that the biblical idea offers the most comprehensive and profound philosophy of sex.

SMILEY BLANTON, M.D.

New York, New York.

#### **Christ and Human Personality.**

By J. C. Massee. Revell. \$1.25. A series of addresses about the central theme of Christ and his practical power in everyday life.

**101 Prayers for Peace.** Compiled by G. A. Cleveland Shriveley. Westminster. \$1.00. Prayers by men of God, uttered with faith despite the "signs of the times."

**What I Believe.** By Sholem Asch. Putnam. \$2.00. A compelling expression of the faith, hope and understanding of the author of *The Nazarene*.

**Amateur Choir Director.** By Carl Hjortsvang. Abingdon-Cokesbury. \$1.00.

**The Choirmaster and Organist.** By H. J. Staples. Epworth. 3s. Helpful hints for well-meaning but untrained choir directors.

**An Exegetical Grammar of the New Testament.** By William Douglas Chamberlain. Macmillan. \$4.00. A practical and concise textbook for those seeking help in the early days of Greek study.

**The Cross.** By J. Scott Lidgett. Epworth. 2s 6d. Themes from the Epistles which stress the connection of the Lord's Supper and the Spiritual Life.

**The Seed and the Soil.** By Richard Terrill Baker. Friendship. \$1.00. By soliloquy and dialogue the book discusses problems of Christian youth with an authority of tone and conviction of purpose.

**God and Human Suffering.** By R. H. L. Slater. Epworth. 5s. An interpretation of the book of Job in the light of today's events.

**John Hus and the Czech Reform.** By Matthew Spinka. University of Chicago Press. \$1.50. A monograph on the theme of the alleged Wyclifism of Hus.

**In Tune With Wedding Bells.** By Grace Livingston Hill. Lippincott. \$2.00. A story true to style in interest, but lacking reality by forced religious situations.

**Beneath Our Roof.** By Louis Paul Lehman, Jr. Christopher. \$2.00. Poems with a homey touch by a youth with a mellow mind.

## Bookish Brevities

The article by Dr. John Sutherland Bonnell, on the Church situation in Great Britain, was written as a product of his recent visit to the British Isles, and is to be included in his forthcoming book, *Britons Under Fire*, to be published by Harper & Bros., New York.

After having been the editor of the *Times* of London for twenty-nine years, Geoffrey Dawson has just retired. He is succeeded by Barrington-Ward, who has been with the paper for fourteen years. Mr. Dawson never let his name be published abroad, preferring to let his paper speak for him.

Duke University has just added to its rare collection of ancient Greek manuscripts. The new acquisition is of the four Gospels inscribed by an eleventh century scribe. The manuscript is said to be in an excellent state of preservation.

The American Bible Society has announced (in connection with Universal Bible Sunday) the publication of a brochure entitled *The Light That Will Not Go Out*. It is to be written by Kenneth Scott Latourette, a frequent contributor to *RELIGION IN LIFE*. This brochure is to be included in the October issue of the *Bible Society Record*, and mailed to 100,000 pastors in sixty communions in the United States.

If it's a book on zebras you are looking for, watch for the stripes. Alligator skin will indicate a volume on reptiles, while elephant hide will betray the subject of pachyderms. So you *can* judge a book by its cover—if the book is bound by Maurice A. Hamonneau, the renowned Frenchman who adapts all his binding materials to the subject of the book. What would he do with *Blood, Sweat and Tears*!

Faith Cabin Library is composed of twenty-six units, keeping 100,000 volumes in circulation among the Negro race. This library was inaugurated nine years ago by Willie Lee, now a senior in the Crozer Theological School. The library is growing by virtue of the interest of kind friends who send spare books, post prepaid, to M. W. Buffington, Edgefield, South Carolina.

In the retirement of Dr. Harry M. Lydenberg as director of the New York Public Library, the publishing profession has lost a staunch supporter in its relationship with libraries in general. It was Dr. Lydenberg's foresight of the value of recording the events of contemporary book publishing history, that led to the Bowker Lectures. These annual lectures have become more and more important to the field of publishing in its relation to libraries and book distribution.

## INDEX—VOLUME X

### A

- Aubrey*: Do or Die: The "Christian" Colleges, 586.  
*Australia's Place in the World's Conflict*: *Stewart*, 506.

### B

- Baker*: The Church in the United States Maps a Plan, 390.  
*Bergson*—In Retrospect: *Krust*, 170.  
*Bertocci*: The Focus of Religious Education, 54.  
 Beyond the Possible: *Kosak*, 41.  
 Bible in the Strategy of the Christian Enterprise Today, The: *North*, 380.  
*Bonnell*: Cast Down But Not Destroyed, 595.  
*Buckham*: What Is Dialectic? 287.

### C

- Canadian Christians and Postwar Reconstruction: *Silcox*, 543.  
 Cast Down But Not Destroyed: *Bonnell*, 595.  
 Central Europe and the Present Tragedy: *Hromádka*, 347.  
 Christian's Choice in Time of War, The: *Fitch*, 357.  
 Christian Doctrine of Vocation, The: *Gibson*, 606.  
 Christian Ethics and Social Obligation: *Holloway*, 112.  
 Christian Faith in Political Philosophy: *Douglass*, 267.  
 Christ of the Gospels: *Grant*, 430.  
 Church in the United States Maps a Plan, The: *Baker*, 390.  
 Church in the Time of War: *White*, 74.  
 Conscientious Objector in American Law, The: *Gia Russo*, 333.  
*Corwin*: A Modern Protestant View of Nature and Grace, 103.  
*Cram*: Religion in Stone, 580.  
*Currie*: The Prayer Book of Jews and Christians, 558.

### D

- Day*: The Form of Revelation, 495.  
*Dicks*: Religion and Health, 513.  
 Do or Die: The "Christian" Colleges: *Aubrey*, 586.  
*Douglass*: Christian Faith in Political Philosophy, 267.  
 Drop These Party Cries!: *Smith*, 483.

### E

- Eschatology and Reunion: *Grant*, 83.  
 Existential Thinking in American Theology: *Tillich*, 452.

### F

- Fairfield*: The Menace to China Missions—An Administrator's View, 399.  
*Fallow*: Religious Education—A Job for Parents, 250.  
 Fascination of the Terrible, The: *Organ*, 372.  
*Ferré*: The Immorality of Science, 31.  
*Fitch*: The Christian's Choice in Time of War, 357.  
 Focus of Religious Education, The: *Bertocci*, 54.  
*Foerster*: French Civilization and French Collapse, 570.  
 Form Criticism as an Experiment: *Perlis*, 196.  
 Form of Revelation, The: *Day*, 495.  
 French Civilization and French Collapse: *Foerster*, 570.  
 From Canterbury to Calvary: *Marlatt*, 364.

### G

- Gale*: The Menace to China Missions—A Layman's View, 256.  
*Gia Russo*: The Conscientious Objector in American Law, 333.  
*Gibson*: The Christian Doctrine of Vocation, 606.  
*Grant*: Eschatology and Reunion, 83; The Christ of the Gospels, 430.

### H

- Holloway*, Christian Ethics and Social Obligation, 112.  
 Hope of a New World, The: *Temple*, 323.  
*Hromádka*: Central Europe and the Present Tragedy, 347.

### I

- Immorality of Science, The: *Ferré*, 31.  
 Importance of Jesus for the Twentieth Century, The: *Rowlingston*, 121.

### K

- King*: The Small Sects and the Primitive in Religion, 237.  
*Kosak*: Beyond the Possible, 41.  
*Krust*: *Bergson*—In Retrospect, 170.

### L

- "Like People, Like Priest": *Pattison*, 130.  
 Little Flower of New England, A: *Mabon*, 185.

### M

- Mabon*: A Little Flower of New England, 185.  
*Marlatt*: Science, Philosophy and Faith, 3.  
*Marlatt*: From Canterbury to Calvary, 364.  
*McGiffert*: What Is Church? 163.  
 Meetinghouse, The: *Trueblood*, 534.  
*Meland*: The Tragic Sense of Life, 212.  
 Menace to China Missions—A Layman's View: *Gale*, 256;  
 —An Administrator's View, *Fairfield*, 399.  
*Menzel*: The Religious Evaluation of History, 92.  
 Modern Protestant View of Nature and Grace, A: *Corwin*, 103.

### N

- Non-Pacifist Christian, The: *Straton*, 278.  
*North*: The Bible in the Strategy of the Christian Enterprise Today, 380.

### O

- Organ*: The Fascination of the Terrible, 372.

### P

- Parson's Pleasure*—A Chat About Novels: *Schroeder*, 136.  
*Pattison*: "Like People, Like Priest," 130.  
*Pennepacker*: Theism and Pragmatic Naturalism, 411.  
*Perlis*: Form Criticism as an Experiment, 196.  
 Philosophy and Theology: *Tillich*, 21.  
 Prayer Book of Jews and Christians, The: *Currie*, 558.  
 Problem of the Church, The: *Schofield*, 64.

### Q

- Quarter's Fiction, The: *Schroeder*, 292, 456, 614.

## R

- Rebuilding a Truth-Centered Civilization: *Sloan*, 223.  
 Religion and Health: *Dicks*, 513.  
 Religious Education—A Job for Parents: *Fallow*, 250.  
 Religious Evaluation of History, The: *Mensel*, 92.  
 Religion in Stone: *Cram*, 580.  
 Rowlingson: The Importance of Jesus for the Twentieth Century, 121.

## S

- Schofield: The Problem of the Church, 64.  
 Schroeder: Parson's Pleasure—A Chat About Novels, 136; The Quarter's Fiction, 292, 456, 614.  
 Science, Philosophy and Faith: *Mariain*, 3.  
 Search for Peace: *Welch*, 525.  
 Shaw: The Validity of Religious Knowledge, 442.  
 Silcox: Canadian Christians and Postwar Reconstruction, 543.  
 Sloan: Rebuilding a Truth-Centered Civilization, 223.  
 Small Sects and the Primitive in Religion, The: *King*, 237.  
 Smith, Herbert Booth: Drop These Party Cries! 483.  
 Smith, Roy Leslie: The Spirit of Greece, 424.  
 Spirit of Greece, The: *Smith*, 424.  
 Stewart: Australia's Place in the World's Conflict, 506.  
 Stratton: The Non-Pacifist Christian, 278.

## T

- Temple: The Hope of a New World, 323.  
 Theism and Pragmatic Naturalism: *Pennepacker*, 411.  
 Tillich: Philosophy and Theology, 21; Existential Thinking in American Theology, 452.  
 Tragic Sense of Life, The: *Meland*, 212.  
 Trueblood: The Meetinghouse, 534.

## V

- Validity of Religious Knowledge, The: *Shaw*, 442.

## W

- Welch: The Search for Peace, 525.  
 What Is Church? *McGiffert*, 163.  
 What Is Dialectic? *Buckham*, 287.  
 White: The Church in Time of War, 74.  
 Book Reviews, 142, 298, 462, 620.  
 Bookish Brevities, 159, 319, 480, 638.

20



